

# **Public Access Supplement**

**to the San Francisco Bay Plan**



HD  
1695  
.S26  
S26  
1979  
c.2

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

**SAN FRANCISCO BAY PLAN  
PUBLIC ACCESS SUPPLEMENT**

**US Department of Commerce  
NOAA Coastal Services Center Library  
2234 South Hobson Avenue  
Charleston, SC 29405-2413**

**San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission  
30 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco 94102 (415) 557 3686**

**Adopted April 5, 1979**

This publication was prepared with financial assistance  
from the U. S. Office of Coastal Zone Management,  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
under the provisions of the Federal  
Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended.

---

## CREDITS

---

This report was prepared by the staff of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission under the general direction of Kent E. Watson, Bay Development Design Analyst.

Consultant Armin Rosencranz, attorney-at-law, provided technical assistance on public access, security, and maintenance issues; consultant landscape architect Reed Dillingham prepared the appearance and design illustrations.

This publication was prepared with financial assistance  
from the U. S. Office of Coastal Zone Management,  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
under the provisions of the Federal  
Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended.

## FOREWORD

The Public Access Supplement to the San Francisco Bay Plan is the comprehensive advisory guide for the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission and other interested parties to use in working to provide and maintain public access to and along the shoreline of San Francisco Bay. The primary goal of the Supplement is to improve implementation of the Commission's policy of providing maximum feasible public access to the Bay in the permit process. An important secondary goal of the Supplement is to encourage and support local park and open space agencies in their plans for acquisition and development of important shoreline sites.

The Supplement consists of three parts: the Bay Shoreline Element; the Appearance and Design Element with Public Access Design Guidelines; and the Implementation Element. Two appendices, A and B, contain a compendium of the portions of the Bay Plan, as amended, relating to the provision of public access; and information about possible sources of funding for public access projects, respectively. The Public Access Supplement Map is folded and placed in a pocket inside the back cover of this document. The Map is a general guide to the locations of the most desirable sites for public access around the Bay that are described in Part I, the Bay Shoreline Element.

Because the shoreline of San Francisco Bay is so extensive and varied, the Supplement cannot be considered a complete and final evaluation and recommendation on every part of that shoreline as it relates to public access. Changes in land use and natural conditions over time create a need for detailed analysis of each shoreline site when it is actively considered for public access by the Commission or by any other agency. Also, this Supplement is not intended to show every area where public access may be required as a condition of a permit granted by the Commission. Consequently, absence of a designation for public access in this Supplement does not mean that future permit applicants will be relieved of the obligation to provide maximum feasible public access consistent with a project as is required by the law under which the Commission operates.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	111
INTRODUCTION	1
PART I. THE BAY SHORELINE ELEMENT	4
A. Introduction	4
B. General Findings and Conclusions	4
C. Regional Findings and Conclusions	7
D. County Findings and Sites	14
1. Marin County	14
2. Sonoma, Napa, and Western Solano Counties	19
3. Eastern Solano County	23
4. Contra Costa County	25
5. Alameda County	33
6. Santa Clara County	42
7. San Mateo County	45
8. San Francisco City and County	51
PART II. THE APPEARANCE AND DESIGN ELEMENT	59
A. Recommended Bay Plan Changes	59
B. Public Access Design Guidelines	61
1. Providing Public Access in Shoreline Projects	61
2. The Design of Public Access	64
PART III. THE IMPLEMENTATION ELEMENT	69
A. The Legal Authority for Public Access	69
1. McAteer-Petris Act	69
2. California Constitution	69
3. Subdivision Map Act	70
4. Findings	72
5. Conclusions	72

	Page
B. Changes to the Bay Plan and Commission Procedures	75
1. Amendments to the Bay Plan	75
2. The Permit Process	75
3. The Maintenance Issue	75
4. Additional Administrative Considerations	76
5. Findings	77
6. Conclusions	78
C. Implementation Techniques Requiring Further Study	79
1. BCDC Shoreline Band Jurisdiction	79
2. Relationship With Other State Agencies	80
3. Relationship With Local Agencies	80
4. Coastal Conservancy	81
5. Findings	82
6. Conclusions	82
D. Other Public Access Issues Considered	83
1. In-Lieu Public Access	83
2. Security and Liability	84
3. Findings	84
4. Conclusions	85

#### APPENDICES

Appendix A--Adopted Bay Plan Amendments To Findings and Policies  
on Public Access and Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views  
and Portions of Part V

Appendix B--Funding Sources For Public Access

#### CREDITS

#### MAPS

Public Access Supplement Map--Located in Backcover Pocket



---

## INTRODUCTION

---

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) is the state agency responsible for regulating development activities in and adjacent to San Francisco Bay. Since the Commission has no management authority over the area of its regulatory jurisdiction--all of the Bay subject to tidal action and a shoreline band 100 feet wide--it must rely upon permit decisions to convey the mandate set forth in two important documents: the McAteer-Petris Act, the state law that originally established BCDC in 1965; and the San Francisco Bay Plan, the Commission's comprehensive plan incorporated into the law in 1969. In its findings and policies, the Bay Plan clearly emphasizes the need for greater public use and appreciation of the region's most valuable resource--San Francisco Bay. One of the Plan's most important policies--and since 1969 a requirement of the BCDC law--is that "maximum feasible public access, consistent with a proposed project," to the Bay must be provided in any project requiring a BCDC permit.

The nature of the development process is such that at any one time only portions of the shoreline are being developed or changed so as to require a BCDC permit. Public access obtained on a permit-by-permit basis is thus often discontinuous and sometimes unrelated to information about land uses or other factors beyond the scope of the immediate project. The need, therefore, was to develop comprehensive policies and guidelines for public access around the Bay to assist both applicants and the Commission in better satisfying public access needs, especially when permits are sought. On January 20, 1977, acting on the recommendation of two earlier staff reports, the Commission authorized the staff to proceed with public access planning. This Supplement is the primary product of that planning process and was adopted by the Commission on April 5, 1979.

The public access planning process consisted of the preparation by the staff of tentative findings and conclusions relating to public access for nine geographical study units, which together embrace the entire shoreline of San Francisco Bay. These findings and conclusions were based on a physical inventory and analysis by the staff of the land use and natural and visual factors (resources) of the area. Each of these factors was evaluated as to its specific relationship and/or effect on public access to and along the Bay. The tentative findings and conclusions for each shoreline area were widely distributed and

presented to the public at a series of informal evening meetings between May, 1977, and June, 1978, at various locations around the Bay. These tentative findings and conclusions were assembled into the Bay Shoreline Element, which was presented to the Commission on August 17, 1978.

The Appearance and Design Element is based upon the resource inventory and analysis discussed above, as well as staff studies on the activities of the Design Review Board and on the appearance and design of public access. In addition, some of the findings and recommendations from the consultant's report on maintenance and security were included. It was presented to the Commission on October 19, 1978.

The Implementation Element is based largely on the consultant's report on maintenance and security, as well as all of the previous public access planning reports. It provides additional background regarding techniques that might be further explored to generally improve public access to the Bay. The element was presented to the Commission on March 1, 1979. The proposed Bay Plan amendments, although technically part of the Implementation Element, were presented separately, and prior to this element, in order to allow sufficient time for public comment and discussion.

As adopted by the Commission, the completed Supplement will: (a) serve as a comprehensive advisory guide to the Commission and other interested parties in providing for and maintaining shoreline public access; (b) amend and add to certain of the Bay Plan's Findings and Policies on Public Access, Appearance and Design, and Scenic Views to reflect the experience of the Commission and the results of the public access planning efforts; (c) provide a separate manual of public access design guidelines for project developers and designers as recommended by Public Access Policy No. 9 of the Bay Plan; and (d) recommend changes to existing legal and institutional provisions to allow local governments and other agencies to emphasize public access and shoreline appearance and design issues when projects are reviewed and approved by local governments.

Since obtaining shoreline band jurisdiction on November 10, 1969, the Commission has, through the permit process, required that approximately 50 miles of shoreline be set aside for public access. This figure includes those public park projects that required a BCDC permit, but would have probably provided shoreline access regardless of BCDC. A minor portion of these public access permits were to non-park and recreation agencies, such as flood control districts, and public works departments, which would not normally provide public access. On the basis of this rough data,

it is apparent that the public access requirements of the BCDC permit process have been responsible for providing increased and improved public access to the Bay.

The concept of public access, either as a design element or functional activity, had not been defined in 1969. Both the staff and applicants learned through experience that public access is essentially free pedestrian access, usually from a public thoroughfare, to and along the San Francisco Bay shoreline above the highest tide. As a result of conditions in a BCDC permit, public access is often on private land; it may include certain improvements, such as paving, landscaping, and street furniture; it may be subject to certain rules regarding use; and it may allow for additional uses, such as biking, fishing, picnicking, etc.

---

## PART I: THE BAY SHORELINE ELEMENT

---

### A. Introduction

This Bay Shoreline Element is compiled from the findings and conclusions for the nine geographical study units prepared by the staff and presented to the public between May, 1977, and June, 1978. The findings and conclusions for the geographical units were based on a physical inventory and analysis of the land use, natural, and visual factors (resources) of the entire shoreline of San Francisco Bay. Each of the factors was evaluated by the staff as to its specific relationship and/or effect on public access to and along the Bay.

In order to be as concise as possible, this element includes only those revised findings that have specific bearing on each of the public access conclusions. The findings and conclusions of the element are arranged so that they proceed from the general to the specific. The individual public access sites are listed after the findings for each county area.

### B. General Findings and Conclusions

The following findings and conclusions are applicable to public access anywhere along the San Francisco Bay shoreline:

#### 1. Findings

- a. There are approximately 1,000 miles of Bay shoreline (a map calculation including the banks of sloughs, estuaries, and streams within the BCDC jurisdiction). Only about 90 miles of the shoreline are set aside and improved for public access purposes. This includes parks and recreation areas dedicated to and improved for public recreational uses and all public access sites achieved through the BCDC permit process, including all private and public sites that required permits (approximately 50 miles).
- b. Shoreline land uses have significantly affected public access uses that house or serve large numbers of people, such as residential, commercial, and commercial/recreational facilities, create a need for nearby public access to the

Bay. Land uses that may present hazards to the public, such as some water-related industries or uses that require security, such as some military facilities, are generally suitable for only limited public access. Uses such as managed wetlands (duck hunting clubs), although they provide waterfowl habitat, are usually privately owned, located in remote areas, and have appurtenant structures that are vacant for long periods. Consequently, public access, if any, in areas devoted to these uses must be limited and controlled. The proximity of a public thoroughfare to the shoreline as well as the availability of public transportation, increases the suitability of that area for public access. However, in some cases, lack of public parking can be a limiting factor.

- c. The abundant natural resources of the Bay both enhance and constrain public access to and along the shoreline. The occurrence of resources such as stands of native trees, rock outcrops, or flocks of shorebirds enhances the public access experience. However, some natural areas, particularly wildlife habitats, are fragile, in some cases too fragile to withstand human intrusion. Also, natural factors such as steep slopes or high cliffs can pose a serious safety hazard to the public.
- d. Visually, the Bay is the most important orientation element and geographical focal point in the region. Even so, the full potential of the Bay as a visual resource has not been realized. Some areas have limited Bay views because of flat terrain or other natural constraints. In other areas, notably along a number of urban waterfronts, visual access is limited by man-placed obstructions such as buildings, parking lots, fences, billboards, and landscaping which have obstructed or severely detracted from views of and access to the Bay.

## 2. Conclusions

- a. The Commission shall continue to pursue vigorously its statutory mandate of requiring that maximum feasible public access to the Bay be provided in all projects within its

jurisdiction, particularly in urban areas where a high need for such access exists. As part of this task, the Commission should continue to coordinate with and seek the cooperation of local, state, and federal governments and special districts for the attainment of public access continuity around the Bay. (Because of BCDC's limited shoreline jurisdiction, such cooperation and action by other agencies is essential for providing connections to shoreline sites.)

- b. Public access to natural areas around the Bay is highly desirable, but should be subject to the following special considerations, especially in rural and undeveloped areas:
  - (1) Because of potential conflicts with wildlife uses, public access to tidal marshes, managed wetlands, and sensitive habitat areas should be provided only where the access can be controlled and managed, preferably by an appropriate public agency or non-profit organization. To assist in this management, additional in-depth studies are needed to evaluate the impact of public access on these areas. Until such studies are complete, access should only be provided where it can be shown in advance, through an environmental assessment or environmental impact report, that the habitat will not be adversely affected.
  - (2) In order to provide for appropriate public access to tidal marshes, managed wetlands, and other sensitive habitat areas, all agencies involved with the acquisition or management of these areas for public use should allocate sufficient funding for the construction and continuing maintenance of adequate public-use facilities that would safeguard the natural character of the area and are consistent with the protection and maintenance of the natural resources of the area.
  - (3) Any access to the margins of marshes and managed wetlands, particularly in isolated areas, should generally be restricted to

"point" rather than "continuous" access, e.g., access to a point or points on the shoreline rather than continuous access along it, in order to mitigate the adverse impact of human intrusion on wildlife resources, especially the more timid species. Shoreline in this case means the marsh-upland interface, not the marsh-Bay (open water) edge. In some cases, such as for educational purposes or to avoid solid fill in a marsh, a boardwalk over a portion of a marsh may be appropriate.

- (4) Some habitats (such as harbor seal hauling grounds, and certain nesting sites and hunting areas) may only be suitable for access seasonally when not being used by wildlife or hunters.
- c. In areas of bluffs, cliffs, steep slopes, or other hazardous conditions where physical contact with the Bay may be dangerous or impractical, shoreline access may still be desirable and, therefore, should be at elevated locations (on bluffs or hilltops) overlooking the Bay and shoreline.
- d. In its consideration of public access, the Commission should make the finding that maximum feasible public access to the Bay includes visual, as well as physical, access to the Bay.

C. Regional Findings and Conclusions

The following findings and conclusions relate to a large portion or portions of the Bay shoreline:

1. Findings

- a. The proximity of railroad tracks has effectively precluded safe physical access to some portions of the Bay shoreline. For example, nearly 25 miles of the scenic Contra Costa County shoreline between Richmond and Martinez are either occupied or directly influenced by the Santa Fe, Southern Pacific, or Richmond Belt Line Railroads. Other shoreline areas affected by railroad tracks and operations include the Suisun Marsh, the Napa Marshes, the Petaluma Marshes, the Oakland

(Western Pacific) Mole, and portions of the South Bay and San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

- b. Various types of industry, some water-related, have had a significant effect on shoreline access in particular areas. For instance, a substantial portion of the Contra Costa County shoreline is dominated by industrial uses such as the Lion, Shell, Union, Sequoia, and Standard Oil Refineries, and various port and industrial uses along the Richmond Harbor Channels, which have effectively precluded public access. Existing industrial and/or port facilities along the waterfronts of Richmond, Oakland, Alameda, Redwood City, South San Francisco, San Francisco, Vallejo, and Benicia have blocked or restricted public access in those areas. With proper planning and management many of these areas would be suitable for public access without interfering with or presenting risk or hazards to workers or the public.
- c. Naval and military facilities which occupy extensive portions of the Bay shoreline include Skaggs Island Naval Reservation, Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Concord Naval Weapons Station, Point Molate Naval Weapons Depot, Oakland Naval Supply Center, Alameda Naval Air Station, Moffett Naval Air Station, Hunters Point Naval Shipyard (civilian leased), Yerba Buena/Treasure Island Naval Reservation, Oakland Army Base, and the U. S. Coast Guard Reservations at Government Island (Alameda) and Yerba Buena Island (San Francisco). Public access to most of these facilities is necessarily restricted for reasons of security, operation, or public safety. Nearly all of the U. S. Army shoreline facilities in San Francisco and Marin Counties have been turned over to the National Park Service as part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area for public use.
- d. There are many shoreline urban or urbanizing areas that have only limited public access to the Bay. Because of their increasing population and density they need additional shoreline access. Such areas include San



Rafael, Vallejo, Hercules, Pinole, Richmond, Oakland, Alameda (Oakland Estuary side), nearly all shoreline cities in Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties, and San Francisco.

- e. The addition of a number of parks, recreation areas, and other public use facilities has vastly improved public access to and recreational use of the Bay since 1968. These include the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in San Francisco and Marin Counties (National Park Service); McInnis Park in Marin County; Martinez, Point Pinole, George Miller, and Point Isabel Regional Shorelines in Contra Costa County (East Bay Regional Park District); Foster City Linear Shoreline Park; San Mateo Shoreline Park; and Burlingame Bayside and Channel Shoreline strips. A number of new and/or proposed parks are due to open in the near future to further improve shoreline public access. These include: Candlestick Point State Recreation Area in San Francisco and China Camp State Park in Marin County (State Department of Parks and Recreation); San Leandro Bay in Oakland, Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline in San Leandro, and Hayward Regional Shoreline, (East Bay Regional Park District); Sunnyvale Baylands City and County Park; Mountain View Shoreline Regional Park; Palo Alto Baylands expansion; Marsh Road Bayfront Park in Menlo Park; Marlin Park in Redwood City; Fisherman's Park in Brisbane; and the Waterfront Promenade in San Francisco. In addition, portions of the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge, particularly in the Fremont and Alviso areas, will provide improved public access to the Bay.
- f. A number of refuges, wildlife management areas, and ecological preserves have been established around the Bay for the protection and management of fish and wildlife, including Corte Madera Marsh Ecological Reserve, San Pablo Bay State Wildlife Refuge, Napa Marshes Cooperative Wildlife Area, Grizzly Island Wildlife Management Area, Bair Island Wildlife Refuge, and Redwood Shores Ecological Reserve (Department of Fish and Game); Lower Tubbs Island and several South Bay parcels (Nature Conservancy); various parcels (National Audubon

Society); and the San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge and the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge (U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service). As master plans and management programs are adopted and implemented, appropriate public access will be provided at a number of these areas consistent with the laws and policies of the appropriate agency.

- g. There are few opportunities for the public to gain an appreciation and interpretation of the Bay and its natural resources. Bay-oriented interpretive programs or exhibits are, or will soon be, offered at Benicia State Recreation Area (Department of Parks and Recreation); Robert Crown Memorial State Beach in Alameda (East Bay Regional Park District); San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge centers at Fremont and Alviso (U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service); Palo Alto Baylands Nature Interpretive Center; Coyote Point Park Museum (San Mateo County); Golden Gate National Recreation Area, San Francisco and Marin Counties (National Park Service); and Angel Island State Park (State Department of Parks and Recreation). The Roadside Ecological Viewing Areas provided by the Department of Transportation at Hunter Hill Rest Area on Interstate 80 near Vallejo and the Golden Gate Bridge Vista Point in Marin County are valuable interpretive resources with regard to the Bay. Additional Bay-oriented interpretive facilities or programs are proposed by the State Department of Parks and Recreation at Candlestick Point State Recreation Area in San Francisco and at China Camp State Park in Marin County.
- h. Heavily-used transportation corridors near or adjacent to the shoreline offer a high potential for visual access to the Bay for a large number of people. Entrance and panoramic views of the Bay from a number of freeways and locales are critical visual access points. The most outstanding and extended Bay views are available from: (1) a 3-1/2 mile section of Interstate 80, between University Avenue in Berkeley and the Bay Bridge Toll Plaza; and (2) a 2 mile stretch of Highway 101 along the Brisbane (Candlestick) Causeway. Other view areas

include: (1) Highway 101 in southern Marin County (Waldo Grade, Corte Madera); (2) Interstate 680 and Highway 21 near Benicia; (3) Interstate 80, north of Vallejo; (4) a few scattered points on Interstate 80 in Contra Costa County; and (5) near or from the following bridges: Golden Gate, Petaluma River, Napa River, Richardson Bay, Benicia-Martinez, San Mateo, Dumbarton, Carquinez, Bay, and Richmond-San Rafael.

1. Urban areas with their business centers near or adjacent to the shoreline offer an additional potential for visual access to the Bay for large numbers of people. Those cities which take greatest advantage of the visual amenities of the Bay include Sausalito, Belvedere, Tiburon, Vallejo, Benicia, Emeryville, Oakland, Alameda, and San Francisco. Some other shoreline cities such as Berkeley and San Leandro take recreational advantage of the Bay frontage; however, in most cases, their business centers do not visually relate to their bayside setting.
- j. There are many creeks, sloughs, and tributaries to the Bay that historically provided a connection between the Bay and nearby communities. A number of these were navigable and served as important transportation links to the ports and cities around the Bay. Such contemporary communities as Redwood City, San Mateo, Millbrae, San Bruno, and Union City were traditionally served by these waterways. However, the effects of changing land uses over time have either severed these links or rendered them useless for water or shoreline access purposes. While many of these waterways may be permanently blocked, others offer opportunities as corridors for future public access.

## 2. Conclusions

- a. The Commission shall take an active role in improving public access to the Bay where railroad right-of-ways and operations now preclude or restrict such access. The Contra Costa County shoreline, from Martinez to Richmond, should receive highest priority.

- b. In most cases, public access to the Bay as part of water-related industries and port facilities, particularly in or near urban areas, is both desirable and feasible. The Commission encourages owners and operators of these facilities to integrate public access features into their facility planning at an early stage. The Commission's Design Review Board should review and critique these plans in their preliminary stage in order to assist project developers in meeting the requirement for maximum feasible public access consistent with safety and operational requirements.
- c. The Commission shall work with the U. S. Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard to obtain improved public access to the Bay on those installations that offer high potential for access consistent with safety and operational requirements.
- d. The governments of all existing and growing urban shoreline areas shall vigorously provide for improved public access to the Bay. This should include, but not be limited to, park, recreation, and open space areas with waterfront paths and facilities; acquisition of such areas; and tideland and waterfront ordinances emphasizing public access as part of every shoreside development. The Commission shall assist in these local efforts to the maximum feasible extent.
- e. All agencies--local, state, federal, or special districts--that have authority to acquire, develop, and manage recreational, park, open space, and wildlife refuge lands should emphasize or continue to emphasize bayfront lands in their planning and development. In their management and operation of these areas, the responsible agencies should provide and maintain facilities that generally enhance the Bay-related nature of the site, e.g., although athletic fields may be important they are not Bay-related. In the planning of these facilities, consideration should be given to inclusion of signs, interpretive displays, and programs that offer information relative to the importance of the Bay ecosystem. In particular,

this potential needs to be explored in any new or existing public use areas in or near urban areas.

- f. Freeways and major highways near the Bay should be aligned, built, landscaped, and maintained so as to improve and dramatize Bay views. The recent pruning and clearing of trees and shrubs along Highway 101 at the Brisbane Causeway by the Department of Transportation has opened new and dramatic views of the Bay. Similar attention needs to be paid to the landscaping and fencing of other routes, such as Highway 101 above Sausalito; Interstate 80 near Rodeo; and Highway 101 at the Sierra Point curve in Brisbane. Where possible, the railing design of the Richmond-San Rafael and Bay Bridges should be altered so as to realize the full potential of extensive Bay views from these two spans.
- g. Agencies that have jurisdiction or operations in, near, or adjacent to the Bay should actively seek to provide, enhance, and maintain improved visual contact with and access to the Bay. Cities such as Oakland, Alameda, and San Francisco that have main streets ending at or passing parallel to the shoreline should take advantage of the access and Bay views offered from these thoroughfares. These existing right-of-ways should be "opened-up" to the Bay when and where feasible and provided with appropriate public amenities. Urban design plans should emphasize the visual and physical connection of the city centers to the Bay.

D. County Findings and Sites

The following findings and conclusions relate to most of the suitable sites for public access around the Bay. They are listed in clockwise manner, starting with Marin County and ending with San Francisco County. Any shoreline public access to marsh areas refers to the marsh-upland interface, not to the marsh-Bay (open water) edge.

The Public Access Supplement Map, locating the exceptional and important sites listed below, is located in a pocket inside the back cover of this document.

1. Marin County

a. Specific Findings

- (1) A number of areas along Marin County's 92-mile Bay shoreline could provide additional public access. The northern Sausalito waterfront offers the potential of providing for the continuity of shoreline access, has at least one significant non-public shoreline vista point (Schoonmaker), and has a number of existing and potential fishing sites.
- (2) The shoreline in the Manzanita Green area north of Sausalito Point is one of the few remaining areas of open-water, Bay shoreline immediately adjacent to Highway 101 in Marin County that is of high visual quality and potential recreation value. This shoreline is recommended for open space or public park use by the Marin Countywide Plan and the various other city and community plans related to the area.
- (3) Although most of the Bothin Marsh on Richardson Bay between Coyote Creek and Almonte Boulevard is in public ownership, developed public access in this area is limited to the bicycle path along the edge of Almonte Boulevard and parallel to the south bank of Coyote Creek. The abandoned Northwestern Pacific Railroad embankment through the marsh, while not improved for access, is now utilized by hikers. This right-of-way is proposed for future acquisition and development as a multi-use trail. The upper portion of Richardson Bay is a significant shoreline open space for public access with fishing sites and the potential for connections to existing and planned public sites, as well as an outstanding vista point on the knoll south of the Mill Valley Public Safety Building.
- (4) All of the shoreline around Belloc Lagoon to Brickyard Park along Seminary Drive and south along the west side of Strawberry Point is adjacent to bird habitat, is of high visual quality, provides good fishing

sites, and would provide continuity in the existing public access. Sections are either owned and/or managed by the Strawberry Recreation District.

- (5) Strawberry Spit is a significant shoreline open space adjacent to a residential area which provides high quality views of the Bay. The northern portion is also a critical seasonal hauling ground for harbor seals.
- (6) The point of land between the Strawberry Recreation District boat dock (Harbor Cove Way) and the Salt Works Canal (Greenwood Bay Drive) offers outstanding views of the Bay and San Francisco skyline and lies between two existing pedestrian shoreline trails.
- (7) A segment of significant open waterfront occurs in downtown Tiburon between the foot of Tiburon Boulevard and Elephant Rock on property owned by the Northwestern Pacific Railroad/Waterfront Properties. According to the City's 1975 Downtown Plan, a 200-foot-wide strip of shoreline along the Bay will remain open and available for public access to the waterfront.
- (8) Bluff Point in Tiburon is a significant vista point, open space, and natural area which borders on Keil Cove, an important bird habitat, and Raccoon Strait with its existing and potential fishing sites.
- (9) The entire east side of the Tiburon Peninsula is a particularly significant natural resource area (primarily native vegetation and wildlife) with a number of potential fishing sites between Raccoon Strait and Paradise Cove, a Marin County park, which is the only point of public access along this shoreline. Other potential public access sites include the Tiburon Net Depot area and the breakwaters at Paradise Cay where there are important shoreline vista points and likely fishing sites.

- (10) The area of the Corte Madera/Larkspur marshes (including the Triangular, Muzzi, Hahn, and Heerdt Marshes) and levees is a highly significant shoreline open space and bird habitat with the potential for providing access linkages to existing and planned public access sites. The Department of Fish and Game has acquired the Corte Madera Marsh (formerly Heerdt Marsh) and will manage it for wildlife use with limited public access.
- (11) Both banks of Corte Madera Creek above the Northwestern Pacific Railroad Bridge, while not within the Commission's shoreline band jurisdiction, offer a number of potential public access sites which could be connected (with some inland detours) to provide for a reasonably continuous accessway to the Bay. These sites include the small boat ramp on Lucky Drive and the open space between South Eliseo Drive and the freeway.
- (12) The extensive shoreline of east San Rafael, from Point San Quentin to San Rafael Creek, is a significant open space area and bird habitat adjacent to an urban area. It is planned as continuous access by the City of San Rafael in an area which now offers little shoreline access. The offshore Marin Islands are important natural features which provide critical bird nesting habitat.
- (13) Portions of the shoreline between San Rafael Creek and Point San Pedro, including the Loch Lomond Yacht Harbor and the bluff area to the west of it, offer imposing views of the Bay and distant shorelines.
- (14) The shoreline of Point San Pedro, particularly along the south and west sides, is a significant open space area, fishing site, and shoreline vista point, adjacent to bird habitat, that could provide for continuous shoreline access between existing sites along East San Pedro Road and McNears Beach County Park.



- (15) The San Pablo Bay shoreline, from Gallinas Creek to Petaluma Point, is an extensive open space and traditional hunting area adjacent to an important bird habitat, the 12,320 acre San Pablo Bay State Wildlife Area, that has the capability of providing additional public access sites. The possible takeover of the former Hamilton Air Force Base by a public agency will significantly increase shoreline access potential in this extensive area that has no existing public access.
- (16) The Petaluma River shoreline, from Black Point to the county line on San Antonio Creek, including the edge of the Petaluma Marshes (planned for acquisition by the Department of Fish and Game), is a significant natural open space and important bird habitat adjacent to open water, which, north of Black John Slough, is capable of providing some access on a levee system where no public access now exists.

b. Exceptional Shoreline Sites

The following sites provide exceptional opportunities for additional public access:

- (1) The existing undeveloped points of land along the Sausalito waterfront, including the frontage strip in the Manzanita Green area.
- (2) The remaining undeveloped portions of the upper Richardson Bay shoreline west of the Highway 101 Bridge, including the Northwestern Pacific Railroad right-of-way, and the eucalyptus knoll and east shore near Shelter Bay.
- (3) The shoreline along Strawberry Peninsula, from and including Seminary Drive, around to the spit.
- (4) Strawberry Spit, if closely managed by a responsible agency or organization to protect use by the harbor seals.

- (5) All of the shoreline between the public boat dock at Harbor Cove Way and Greenwood Bay.
- (6) The existing open shoreline east of the downtown area of Tiburon.
- (7) Bluff Point at the end of the Tiburon Peninsula.
- (8) Any of the undeveloped areas along the east side of the Tiburon Peninsula.
- (9) Along the edge of the Triangular, Corte Madera, and Larkspur Marshes to the extent needed to provide access continuity.
- (10) Point San Quentin and the entire shoreline between the point and San Rafael Creek.
- (11) Those undeveloped sections of shoreline between the mouth of San Rafael Creek and the Loch Lomond Yacht Club area.
- (12) The shoreline along Point San Pedro from Main Drive (San Rafael), to McNears Beach County Park.
- (13) Several points on the levees along San Pablo Bay and Novato Creek, from Gallinas Creek to Petaluma Point including Day Island (continuity for these access points would have to be provided inland).

c. Important Sites

The following sites are also extremely important for public access, particularly since they would provide for a variety of shoreline experiences and for access continuity along the Bay:

- (1) The Upper Richardson Bay shoreline between the Highway 101 Bridge and Seminary Drive.
- (2) The tidelands along the west side of Belvedere Island.
- (3) The existing and de facto access sites along both shores of Corte Madera Creek above the Northwestern Pacific Bridge.

- (4) The shoreline between East Sir Francis Drake Boulevard and Point San Quentin (if and when the prison is abandoned).
- (5) Along Gallinas Creek from the Marin County Civic Center to McInnis Park including Margarita Island (outside BCDC jurisdiction).
- (6) Several points on the levees along the Petaluma River and San Antonio Creek between Black Point and the County disposal area.

2. Sonoma, Napa and Western Solano Counties

a. Specific Findings

- (1) This northern shoreline of San Francisco Bay comprises approximately 149 miles as follows: Sonoma County 73 miles; Napa County 46 miles; and western Solano County 30 miles. The east levee system of the Petaluma River is: (a) adjacent to the Cloudy Bend Recreation Area proposed by the City of Petaluma, (b) close to the navigable open water channel of the river, (c) directly adjacent to, yet safely removed from, the Petaluma Marshes, (d) adjacent to historic Donahue Landing, and (e) capable of serving as a direct link for pedestrians and bicyclists between Petaluma and the Bay.
- (2) The Bay levee system from the mouth of the Petaluma River east to the Mare Island Shipyard provides access to a variety of views, wildlife habitats, and shoreline conditions. However, the levees are privately-owned and not now proposed for acquisition as part of the federal San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge.
- (3) The west bank of Tolay Creek provides a connection between Highway 37 and the San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge.
- (4) The west bank of Sonoma Creek passes through some of the only freshwater riparian woodland near the Bay, is

adjacent to wildlife habitat, and can potentially connect Highway 121 with Highway 37 (except for a needed crossing at East Branch).

- (5) The north side of Highway 37, between the Sonoma Creek Bridge and the salt pond dike, is directly adjacent to a valuable wildlife habitat and numerous fishing sites.
- (6) The dike between the salt pond and wetland area, extending north from Highway 37 to South Slough thence east along Dutchman Slough, is adjacent to rich bird habitat, passes next to both tidal marshes and open sloughs, and would provide a connection between the Department of Fish and Game accessway along Dutchman Slough and Highway 37.
- (7) The dikes on either side of the salt pond pump intake channel, south of Highway 37, are now used by fisherman and offer the only physical and visual access to the open Bay along Highway 37 between Sonoma Creek and Mare Island Strait.
- (8) The Napa River dikes between the new, high level Suscol Bridge and Bull Island border the navigable open water channel of the river, are reasonably close to developing areas, and are adjacent to both wildlife habitats and fishing sites.
- (9) Portions of the east dike of the Napa River between Fagan Slough and White Slough (Solano County) pass adjacent to salt ponds, along the open water channel of the River, and are adjacent to both wildlife habitats and fishing sites and to the fast developing residential areas west of Highway 29.
- (10) The dike along the south side of Dutchman Slough, between the Department of Fish and Game accessway along the Slough and Highway 37 (at Guadalcanal Village), would provide an important connection to this accessway at an area where staging

facilities could be provided at the old Navy housing site which has been declared surplus by the U.S. General Services Administration.

- (11) The short unimproved waterfront strip (approximately 1,500 feet) between the City Marina and the private yacht club, and the existing open space area between the City industrial park (Kaiser and Kiewit) and Chestnut Street along the Mare Island Strait in Vallejo, are highly suited for public access in that they would provide for shoreline continuity in areas of compatible land uses.
- (12) Potential fishing sites and views of Mare Island Strait and Carquinez Strait exist along portions of the shoreline around historic Mare Island Naval Shipyard, an operational U.S. Navy facility. Current Navy policy precludes access except on official business.

b. Exceptional Shoreline Sites

Following sites provide exceptional opportunities for additional public access, subject to adoption of federal and state management programs:

- (1) A connection between Schoenberger Park in Petaluma and the Bay largely utilizing inboard dikes and upland routes along the east side of the Petaluma River. A few points of access to the river should be provided as part of this system.
- (2) A controlled access connection between the mouth of the Petaluma River and the Mare Island Naval Shipyard (along part of the San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge) utilizing both levees and upland routes. Between Sonoma Creek and Vallejo, the access would be along the edge of Highway 37.
- (3) The north side of Highway 37 from the Sonoma Creek Bridge east to the salt pond dike.

- (4) The dikes on either side of the salt pond pump intake channel.
- (5) Approximately one mile of the south dike of Dutchman Slough between Guadalcanal Village and the Department of Fish and Game accessway along the Slough.
- (6) Portions of the west bank of the Napa River from the new Suscol Bridge south to the tip of Edgerly Island, including the Cuttings Wharf area.
- (7) Portions of the east levee of the Napa River and upland routes from Fagan Slough south to Slaughterhouse Point connecting to the public access planned by the City of Vallejo, thence south to White Slough.
- (8) In the City of Vallejo, between the City Marina and the Vallejo Yacht Club, and between the waterfront industrial park and the railroad right-of-way near Chestnut Street.

c. Important Sites

The following sites are also extremely important for public access, particularly since they would provide for a variety of shoreline experiences and access continuity along the Bay subject to adoption of federal and state management programs:

- (1) Portions of the west bank of Sonoma Creek between Highway 121 and Highway 37.
- (2) The west bank of Tolay Creek from its mouth to Highway 37.
- (3) A connection between the Department of Fish and Game accessway along Dutchman Slough and Highway 37 along the salt pond dike.
- (4) The west bank of the Napa River on Knight Island from South Slough to Dutchman Slough (boat access only).
- (5) The south bank of White Slough from the Napa River to Highway 37.

- (6) The earth-filled portion of the Navy breakwater (Navy Dike #9) at the southeast end of the Mare Island Strait. This site is under control of the Navy and access may pose certain public hazards.

### 3. Eastern Solano County

#### a. Specific Findings

- (1) This portion of the Solano County shoreline, from the Carquinez Bridge to Marshall Cut, extends 255 miles. The north shore of the Carquinez Strait, from the California Maritime Academy to Benicia State Recreation Area, in addition to being a spectacular setting, is adjacent to planned residential areas shown on the General Plans of both the City of Vallejo and Solano County.
- (2) Lopes Road, in the vicinity of the Marshview Road overpass at Highway 21, offers an outstanding elevated vista point overlooking the marsh.
- (3) Even though there are some conflicting land uses (oil wharfs, etc.), the shoreline of the turning basin at Suisun City is immediately adjacent to the downtown area and would provide an important focus for the area. The shoreline between Todd Park and the Suisun Marina is largely in a natural state and close to a residential area. Both banks of Suisun Slough from Suisun City to Hill Slough on the east and Peytonia Slough on the west, including the island perimeter and the north bank of Hill Slough to where the levee leaves the slough, would provide access along a natural shoreline adjacent to the Suisun Marsh with its varied habitats, and would be relatively close to the developing areas of Suisun City and Fairfield. Overall, the Hill Slough area has great potential as a nature study area with an interpretive facility and walkway system.
- (4) The south levee of Montezuma Slough, paralleling a very narrow section of Grizzly Island Road east of Beldons

Landing Bridge, is adjacent to heavily-used open water fishing sites and relatively close to populated areas.

- (5) The Joice Island and Grizzly Island units of the Grizzly Island Wildlife Management Area, administered by the Department of Fish and Game, comprise approximately 10,500 acres or slightly more than 10% of the entire Suisun Marsh area. While public access is now provided within these areas, increased use of these public areas for such activities as bird watching, nature study, and hiking is desirable and consistent with protection and management of the wildlife resources; however, additional funds are needed to provide for necessary public use facilities and continued dike maintenance.
- (6) Kirby Hill, elevation 361', offers an outstanding vantage point for views of Montezuma Slough, Nurse Slough, Little Honker Bay, and the entire marsh area.
- (7) The entire Collinsville waterfront, from Montezuma Slough to Marshall Cut, the easterly limit of BCDC jurisdiction, is the only area east of Benicia in Solano County that provides visual and physical access to the open Bay, with its shipping, panoramic views, and fishing sites.

b. Exceptional Shoreline Sites

The following sites would provide exceptional opportunities for additional public access:

- (1) The Carquinez Strait shoreline from the California Maritime Academy to Benicia State Recreation Area.
- (2) Portions of the Suisun City waterfront, particularly the turning basin and shoreline between Todd Park and the Suisun Marina.
- (3) Portions of the banks of Suisun, Peytonia, and Hill Sloughs as determined by the Fish and Game Management Program for Peytonia Slough Ecological Reserve and Hill Slough State Wildlife Area.



(4) To the extent consistent with the General Conclusions in section I.B.2. (above) and the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act of 1977:

(a) Those portions of the sound levees around the existing Joice Island and Grizzly Island Units of the Grizzly Island Wildlife Management Area, subject to management control and seasonal closure by the Department of Fish and Game.

(b) That section of shoreline immediately adjacent to Kirby Hill (north of Lingos Landing) on the east side of Montezuma Slough, and at least one suitable vista point on Kirby Hill with views of the Marsh.

(5) The portion of the Collinsville waterfront, that would be compatible with the planned industrial development.

c. Important Sites

To the extent consistent with the General Conclusions above, and the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act of 1977, the following sites are also extremely important for public access, particularly since they would provide for a variety of shoreline experiences and access continuity along the Bay:

(1) All additional sites possible along the Benicia waterfront, with linkages providing a continuous shoreline path system.

(2) A vista point and turnout along Lopes Road near Marshview Road and a bicycle/pedestrian pathway along the frontage road in this area.

(3) The south levee of Montezuma Slough paralleling Grizzly Island Road east of the bridge at Beldons Landing.

4. Contra Costa County

a. Specific Findings

(1) The Contra Costa County shoreline extends 88 miles from Stake Point west to the county line. There are few opportunities

to reach the open Bay in the West Pittsburg industrial and residential areas. Therefore, the entire south bank of Mallard Slough, including both sides of the pump intake channel (outside BCDC jurisdiction) and portions of the shoreline between McAvoy Yacht Harbor and the Navy property, are highly desirable for public access.

- (2) The west bank of Pacheco Creek (Walnut Creek Flood Control Channel) is immediately adjacent to Waterfront Road and provides one of the few opportunities to reach the open Bay between Pittsburg and Martinez.
- (3) The de facto access-way along the Bay between Martinez and Crockett, though constrained by mainline railroad tracks, is a highly desirable public access connection for this visually dramatic part of San Francisco Bay.
- (4) The roadside pull-outs and hilltops along the section of Highway 40 immediately west of Interstate 80 at Crockett, offer dramatic views of the Carquinez Strait and San Francisco Bay. Hill 378, immediately adjacent to the old Selby industrial site, offers outstanding panoramic views of the north-central Bay system.
- (5) The freshwater marsh pond adjacent to the shoreline and railroad tracks just east of Davis Point is an important visual and natural resource which provides wildlife habitat in an attractive setting.
- (6) The unimproved public access site at the Rodeo Sanitary District sewage treatment plant is capable of providing access directly to the Bay for picnicking, viewing, and fishing. The existing marina facilities in the Lone Tree Point area of Rodeo provide private boating access to the Bay. Existing fishing and shoreline access in this area is now subject to a user fee.

- (7) Most of the shoreline between Lone Tree Point and the Old Hercules Wharf is either zoned or being used for industrial purposes. Except for the railroad right-of-way, it is generally suitable for public access. The City of Hercules proposes a waterfront park immediately southwest of the Hercules Wharf area.
- (8) The City of Pinole is currently implementing its plan for the Pinole Creek Linear Park which will ultimately connect to existing public access in the vicinity of the mouth of Pinole Creek and the Pinole Treatment Plant provided through the BCDC permit process. An attractive sand beach and valuable tidal marsh exist immediately to the southwest of the treatment plant in an area zoned as open space. Portions of the area have been acquired by the East Bay Regional Park District.
- (9) Because of the proximity to the Bay of the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks, the shoreline from the treatment plant tidal marsh to Wilson Point is not capable of providing safe public access. However, in this area the high ground between the Southern Pacific tracks and the Santa Fe Railroad tracks is capable of providing an access connection from Pinole to Wilson Point, thence westerly to the existing Montarabay Park (Garrity Creek), and the Point Pinole Regional Shoreline with its 1,226-foot long fishing pier.
- (10) Wilson Point is a significant rocky promontory that provides outstanding panoramic views of the Bay and adjacent shoreline. It is heavily used for fishing access.
- (11) The tidal marshes at the mouth of Wildcat and San Pablo Creeks are on the list of potential acquisition sites by the East Bay Regional Park District. Other plans for this area call for recreational facilities to be developed along San Pablo and Wildcat Creeks in conjunction with

proposed flood control projects. The lands of the Richmond Sanitary landfill are recommended in various adopted plans for acquisition as shoreline recreation parkland when no longer needed for land fill.

- (12) The Standard Oil Company dikes separating the settling ponds from the Bay are capable, with improvements, of providing a controlled pedestrian access link between the Wildcat Creek marshes and the Point San Pablo area. Some land use conflicts may exist because of plant operations near the west end of the dike system and at the Rod and Gun Club Harbor operated by the Chevron Oil Company for its employees. An alternative connection, Castro Street, which passes through the center of this industrial complex, is of insufficient width and is extremely hazardous for use by either pedestrians or bicyclists. Proposed improvements to Castro Street by the City of Richmond do not include provisions for sidewalks or bikeways.
- (13) Although there are some conflicting land uses, such as the Richmond Belt Line Railroad and various industrial uses, the shoreline in the vicinity of Point San Pablo is highly scenic and of considerable historic value because of the old whaling station and the lighthouse on nearby East Brother Island.
- (14) The shoreline between Point San Pablo and the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge is highly scenic and visible to the drivers and passengers utilizing the crossing. The Point Molate Beach Park, the old Winery Building at the Naval Supply Depot, and the Castro Point railway collection are three public attractions in this area. The East Bay Regional Park District proposes a bike path along the existing roadway between these two points. An overlook adjacent to Western Drive above Castro Point offers outstanding views of the north-central Bay area. A connection south to Point Richmond is difficult

because of the intervening freeway approach to the bridge, and roads and pipelines connecting the Richmond Long Wharf and Chevron Refinery.

- (15) The shoreline and lower hill area from George Miller Jr. Regional Shoreline and Point Richmond past Point Potrero and north to Cutting Boulevard are generally capable of providing a regional trail connection as indicated on plans of the City of Richmond and the East Bay Regional Park District. Nearby Nickols Knob and Hill 322 offer outstanding panoramic views of the Bay and Richmond Port activities. The potential for exciting views of shipping traffic in the Harbor Channel and nearby shipyard activities exists in the Point Potrero area at the foot of Canal Boulevard.
- (16) Conflicting land uses such as port and heavy industry, and poor circulation routes now preclude public access to most of the east side of the Santa Fe Channel and Harbor Channel. However, because of the potential of views of Channel traffic and port activities, public viewing access might be developed at either the foot of 8th Street, or at the end of Scott Avenue along the east side of the Harbor Channel.
- (17) The entire Richmond Inner Harbor Basin will be developed as a public marina and a commercial recreation/residential facility. Pursuant to the Richmond Special Area Plan prepared and adopted for this area by the City of Richmond and BCDC, complete peripheral public access to the basin and the southern peninsula will be provided. The Richmond Special Area Plan recognizes the potential for a public access connection between the Harbor Basin and Point Isabel Regional Shoreline along the Santa Fe Railroad spur bordering the shoreline of the Bay.
- (18) The Hoffman Marsh area, an extremely valuable visual resource and natural wildlife habitat, is on a list of

potential acquisition sites by the East Bay Regional Park District. The proximity of the very busy Hoffman Boulevard to the Bay shoreline essentially precludes any public access along this portion of San Francisco Bay. The Department of Transportation plans to upgrade the Boulevard to a limited access freeway.

- (19) Point Isabel Regional Shoreline provides improved public access along the Hoffman Marsh channel and northern extremity of the point area. The western shoreline of the point offers vivid panoramic views of the Bay and Golden Gate Bridge and is a currently popular fishing site.

b. Exceptional Shoreline Sites

The following sites provide exceptional opportunities for additional public access:

- (1) The south bank of Mallard Slough and east bank of the adjacent pump station channel.
- (2) Portions of the shoreline in the vicinity of McAvoy Yacht Harbor west to the Navy property.
- (3) The west bank of Pacheco Creek from Waterfront Road to the Bay.
- (4) A developed overlook of the Carquinez Bridge and Strait along old Highway 40 just west of Crockett.
- (5) A public access vista point in the Tormey-Selby Hills area (Hill 378).
- (6) Improved free public access facilities at Rodeo Sanitary District Plant site and the marinas in the Lone Tree Point area.
- (7) The proposed parks along the Hercules and Pinole waterfront areas.
- (8) The beach area southwest of the Pinole Wastewater Treatment Plant.
- (9) An upland path system between the Santa Fe and Southern Pacific Railroad tracks connecting Pinole with the Wilson Point

area, and including Wilson Point, thence westerly paralleling the Southern Pacific tracks to Point Pinole Regional Shoreline.

- (10) A trailway generally following the upland marsh edge from Point Pinole Regional Shoreline south to the proposed San Pablo Creek Park thence south to the proposed Wildcat Creek Park. Portions of this trail could be incorporated into the proposed North Richmond bypass roadway between Castro Street and Rheem Avenue.
- (11) An access connection between the proposed Wildcat Creek Park and Center and the railroad right-of-way along the Point San Pablo shoreline, either:
  - (a) south and west along the outboard refinery dikes to and past the Refinery Rod and Gun Club Yacht Harbor; or
  - (b) west across the Bay on a low-profile, pile-supported boardwalk (with provision for small boat passage).
- (12) A connection from Point San Pablo south through the Point Molate Naval Fuel Depot (subject to U. S. Navy approval) to, and including, the Western Drive overlook area just west of the existing quarry overlooking Redrock Marina. The site is under control of the Navy and access in some areas may pose certain hazards to the public.
- (13) A public view area at Point Potrero overlooking the harbor channel and shipyard activities.
- (14) The entire shoreline and peninsula of the Richmond Inner Harbor Basin.
- (15) A pathway connecting the Richmond Inner Harbor Basin along the Santa Fe Railroad spur to and including the Hoffman Marsh area (or along an upland route if the inboard wetland is restored by the Department of Transportation).

- (16) The remaining shoreline lands along the southwest portion of Point Isabel.
- (17) A low-profile pile-supported boardwalk connecting Point Isabel with the Albany waterfront fill area to the south (alternative alignment along Hoffman Boulevard could be provided as possible mitigation for freeway construction in this area).

c. Important Sites

The following sites are also extremely important for public access, particularly since they would provide for a variety of shoreline experience and access continuity along the Bay:

- (1) The entire Carquinez Strait shoreline between Martinez and Crockett.
- (2) As development conditions warrant, additional sites in the vicinity of the existing private marinas and the Crockett-Valona Sanitary District site west of the Carquinez Bridge.
- (3) The freshwater pond and bayfront area northwest of Tormey Gardens.
- (4) To provide continuity, a link between Pinole and Crockett connecting with all intervening shoreline access points and pathways.
- (5) The following proposed park and recreation areas: San Pablo Creek Linear Park; Wildcat Creek Center and Park; and the North Richmond landfill area.
- (6) The existing Point Molate Beach Park, the Castro Point Railway collection and rail line, and the Redrock Marina and fishing pier.
- (7) A pedestrian bicycle path connection between the Point Molate area and Point Richmond area possibly as part of the Hoffman Freeway project.
- (8) Public view areas at Nickols Knob and nearby Hill 322.



5. Alameda County

a. Specific Findings

- (1) Between Albany and Drawbridge, the Alameda County shoreline extends 137 miles. The tidal marshes and mudflats of the cove north of the Albany landfill provide important wildlife habitat. The proximity of the very busy Hoffman Boulevard to the Bay shoreline essentially precludes any public access along the eastern edge of the cove without placement of fill in or over the Bay. The Department of Transportation plans to upgrade Hoffman Boulevard to a limited access freeway.
- (2) The proposed park and commercial recreation area on the Albany landfill would provide improved public access to this area. De facto access, mostly for fishing, exists at Fleming Point and along the shoreline adjacent to Golden Gate Fields.
- (3) The shoreline owned by Santa Fe Railroad Company and Murphy is suitable for public access. Development within 100 feet of the Bay would be subject to a BCDC permit. The proposed Berkeley North Waterfront Park will connect with the Berkeley Marina and provide substantial access to the Bay.
- (4) The frontage road shoreline from University Avenue to the Emeryville peninsula, including the Ashby causeway, in addition to providing important Bay views for freeway users, is used extensively by fishermen. While this shoreline is capable of providing a public access trail, the design of such a connection should recognize the value of the area for fishing.
- (5) The marshes and mudflats of the Emeryville Crescent form a highly visible and important wildlife habitat area which, as a site for informal sculptures, has gained nationwide recognition. However, improved

physical access to the shoreline is restricted by the freeway shoulder. Because of the proximity of the freeway and related structures, a shoreline path or boardwalk in this area would require some fill in the Bay. The shoreline in the vicinity of the toll plaza and radio towers, while physically accessible, is restricted by numerous "Private Property" and "No Trespassing" signs. Because of these restrictions, fishermen heavily utilize the shoreline in the immediate area of the KDIA radio transmitter towers. Good views of the Oakland Outer Harbor port activities and the Central Bay are available from the north shore of the Outer Harbor adjacent to the Bay Bridge toll plaza.

- (6) The City of Oakland occupies over 30 miles of Bay shoreline. The West Oakland shoreline, from the Bay Bridge south and east to Jack London Square (10 miles), is utilized extensively for port, shipping, and industrial uses. The only public access along this entire shoreline exists at the Portview Park and fishing pier at Seventh Street, and the Middle Harbor Park and fishing pier at Ferro Street, both provided by the Port of Oakland, the latter via a BCDC permit condition. Even though access is somewhat difficult, the Portview Park at the Seventh Street terminal is heavily used, especially by fishermen. Both this park and the Middle Harbor Park provide closeup views of container shipping activities.
- (7) As the location of the last operating railroad ferry in Oakland, the Oakland (Western Pacific Railroad) Mole is an important and historic shoreline feature which has a small beach area and provides outstanding views of the San Francisco skyline and the shipping activities in the adjacent Middle Harbor and Oakland Estuary. Only one of the three ferry slips is regularly used. Access to the slip area exists off Middle Harbor Road on a private service road adjacent and parallel to a little-used portion of the railroad yards.

- (8) Nearly all the shoreline from the foot of Clay Street to the Lake Merritt Channel is improved and available for public access. However, narrow walkways, parking, and interruptions by several buildings and a working boat yard detract from this otherwise well-used and attractive area. The opportunity for improved visual access exists at the foot of several streets in the area, including Broadway and Madison. The boat launch ramp at Estuary Park is the only such public facility along the entire Oakland shoreline.
- (9) The shoreline at the foot of Fifth Avenue near Clinton Basin offers panoramic views of shipping traffic on the Oakland Estuary as well as the marina activity along the Alameda shoreline.
- (10) The redevelopment of Brooklyn Basin (Embarcadero Cove Area) as a marina and commercial recreation development will generally provide improved public access between Ninth Avenue and Dennison Street.
- (11) Existing industrial uses from Dennison Street east to San Leandro Bay largely preclude any public access to this stretch of shoreline. A notable exception is the heavily-used fishing pier at the Fruitvale Bridge, provided as a condition to a BCDC permit. Another fishing access point at the 29th Avenue-Park Street Bridge, to be provided by the City of Oakland pursuant to a BCDC permit condition, has not yet been built. The right-of-way at the foot of Derby Avenue and the very marginal improvements just west of the High Street Bridge provide the only other points of public access along this section of the Oakland shoreline.
- (12) Nearly all of the Oakland portion of the San Leandro Bay shoreline is or will be available for public access as San Leandro Bay Regional Shoreline, managed by the East Bay Regional Park District under leases granted by the Port of Oakland, the City of Oakland, East Bay Municipal

Utility District, and Pacific Gas and Electric Company. Bay Park Refuge, built by the City of Oakland, and the trails along San Leandro Creek flood control channel are two major existing public access facilities in this area.

- (13) The City of Alameda occupies nearly 2<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> miles of shoreline on the Oakland Estuary, San Leandro Bay, and the central part of the San Francisco Bay. The two miles of beach frontage along Shoreline Drive and Robert Crown Memorial State Beach are the only significant portion of the Alameda shoreline that is improved or available for public access. The Mariner Square development at the foot of Webster Street, the Alameda portion of the Fruitvale Fishing Pier improvements, and the Fernside Shopping Center, all provided through the BCDC permit process, are the only accessible and improved public access points along the Alameda side of the Oakland Estuary. The public launch ramp at the foot of Grant Street and the nearby Alameda Marina are marginally improved and difficult to find. The public access improvements required by a BCDC permit at Alameda Yacht Harbor are incomplete and generally inadequate for shoreline use by the public.
- (14) In addition to the public South Shore Beaches, public access has been provided by BCDC agreements or permits at Ballena Bay, Ravenwood Cove residential area, Lincoln School, and the Crown Harbor residential development. All of the South Shore Beach area is in public ownership, however, the stretch between Broadway Avenue and High Street is generally restricted by encroaching fences from shoreline residential development.
- (15) The shoreline parking lot near the north gate of the Alameda Naval Air Station at Main Street, although in a high hazard and noise hazard zone caused by Navy aircraft operations, offers impressive views of the Estuary and adjacent shipyard and port activities.

- (16) Approved City of Alameda plans propose a trail connection from San Leandro Bay Regional Shoreline westerly to the proposed shoreline access strip along the northern edge of Bay Farm Island that is to be provided pursuant to a BCDC agreement with Harbor Bay Isle Development Corporation.
- (17) Plans for connection of the proposed East Bay Regional Park District Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline to the San Leandro Bay Regional Shoreline to the north are uncertain due to intervening ownership and land uses.
- (18) The City of San Leandro occupies about four miles of the Bay shoreline just south of the Oakland Airport, of which all but 1,400 lineal feet is in City ownership. About a mile of the shore in the marina area has been substantially improved with recreation and park facilities for public use. In total, nearly three miles of the San Leandro shoreline has been or will be developed for public access.
- (19) Most of the shoreline between Roberts Landing and the San Mateo Bridge is retained by dikes, built prior to BCDC creation, which keep Bay waters from encroaching back into areas that were previously part of San Francisco Bay. A 270-acre parcel just north of Johnson Landing will be acquired and restored to tidal marsh as mitigation for construction of the new Dumbarton Bridge. Plans of the East Bay Regional Park District and the Hayward Area Shoreline Planning Agency call for acquisition of 927 acres and provision of various recreational and interpretive facilities at areas including the San Lorenzo Shoreline, Bockman Channel, Hayward Landing area, and southeast of Johnson Landing.
- (20) The shoreline between the San Mateo Bridge and the Alameda Creek Flood Control Channel is characterized by dikes and shorefront tidal marshes. A substantial

portion of the inboard area is devoted to salt ponds. The existing tidal marsh at the mouth of the Old Alameda Creek, an endangered species habitat for both clapper rail and salt marsh harvest mouse, is proposed for acquisition by the East Bay Regional Bay Regional Park District for a regional wildlife preserve. A Park District bicycle and pedestrian trail connects Coyote Hills Regional Park with the Bay along both sides of the Alameda Creek Flood Control Channel.

- (21) The remainder of the shoreline from Alameda Creek south to the county line at Coyote Creek is characterized by dikes separating Bay waters from salt ponds. Bayward of these dikes, substantial tidal marshes serve as habitat for migratory shorebirds and waterfowl, as well as for rare and endangered species such as the salt marsh harvest mouse and the clapper rail. In addition, harbor seals utilize portions of Mowry and Newark Sloughs as hauling grounds. All of this area has been or is scheduled to be acquired by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service as a major portion of the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge with a number of interpretative facilities and controlled access trails to be provided.
- (22) As a result of the BCDC permit issued to the Department of Transportation for the construction of the new Dumbarton Bridge, a portion of the old bridge will be retained as a fishing pier, managed as part of the Refuge. The Refuge plans to retain the old bridge access road as a bike and pedestrian way, as well as providing access for a shuttle bus between the Refuge headquarters and the pier. As part of the bridge construction, the Department of Transportation will provide a trail overcrossing at the toll plaza.

b. Exceptional Shoreline Sites

The following sites provide exceptional opportunities for additional public access;

- (1) A continuous shoreline pathway system from Point Isabel south to Emeryville including the following:
  - (a) A low-profile pile-supported boardwalk connecting Point Isabel with the Albany Waterfront landfill (alternative alignment along Hoffman Boulevard could be provided as possible mitigation for freeway construction in this area).
  - (b) A developed shoreline path system around the Albany Waterfront area, including the proposed park and commercial recreation area, and the Golden Gate Fields-Fleming Point shoreline.
  - (c) The shoreline of the Berkeley waterfront area connecting to the proposed Berkeley North Waterfront Park and the Berkeley Marina area.
  - (d) A pathway connecting the Berkeley Marina with the Emeryville peninsula which would share the existing right-of-way with the freeway frontage road with improvements for parking, fishing, and bicycle/pedestrian pathway.
- (2) Any continuous shoreline access through the Emeryville Crescent should be carefully assessed as to its impact on the narrow shoreline and sensitive habitat. Such access should occur only if under the direct management and supervision of a responsible agency. In any case, the existing beach and roadside areas north of the toll plaza area should be improved for public access.
- (3) Existing Jack London Square area access should be upgraded from Clay Street to Estuary Park as a unified public access promenade.
- (4) A pedestrian promenade from the Ninth Avenue Terminal area along the shoreline of Embarcadero Cove to Dennison Street.
- (5) The entire shoreline of San Leandro Bay, including connections to High Street in Oakland and Doolittle Drive in Alameda, and the Mount Trashmore area in Alameda.

- (6) Entire shoreline of the Harbor Bay Isle Development in Alameda from the Maitland Bridge to the Oakland Airport, with interior connections.
- (7) A developed promenade in Alameda along the Oakland Estuary from the existing Mariner Square development easterly to and including the Pacific Marina.
- (8) The entire shoreline of the proposed Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline at the foot of Davis Street in San Leandro, connecting to the existing San Leandro Marina and Marina Park facilities.
- (9) Utilizing existing outboard and inboard dikes, the trail system proposed by Hayward Area Shoreline Planning Agency and the East Bay Regional Park District between Roberts Landing and Highway 92, including spur routes to proposed bayfront interpretive facilities.
- (10) A trail along the existing dike on the south bank of Old Alameda Creek, from Union City to the Bay.
- (11) The combination bicycle/pedestrian/shuttle bus access route proposed by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service from the Refuge headquarters to the Dumbarton Bridge fishing pier.

c. Important Sites

The following sites are also extremely important for public access, particularly since they would provide for a variety of shoreline experience and access continuity along the Bay:

- (1) The remainder of the Emeryville shoreline not now scheduled for public access improvement.
- (2) To the extent consistent with safe operations, access along the north shore of the Oakland Outer Harbor adjacent to the Bay Bridge and connecting to an interior bikeway system.
- (3) To the extent consistent with safe operations, the outboard end of the Oakland (Western Pacific Railroad) Mole and a safe connection to it from existing public streets.
- (4) A public view area in the vicinity of the foot of Market Street overlooking the Estuary traffic and port activities.



- (5) A public view area at the foot of Fifth Avenue overlooking the Estuary.
- (6) The shoreline of Fortmann Basin and the nearby Alameda Marina and Alameda Yacht Harbor consistent with development plans for the area.
- (7) To the extent consistent with public safety and security restrictions, improved public access along the Alameda shoreline area of the Oakland Estuary immediately adjacent to the North Gate of the Alameda Naval Air Station with appropriate signs warning of potential hazards. This site is under control of the Navy and access may pose certain hazards to the public.
- (8) Improve existing public access at Fernside Shopping Center and provide a through connection to Park Street Bridge.
- (9) Provide missing links to shoreline access from the foot of Encinal Avenue south and west around Alameda shoreline along Shoreline Drive to and including Ballena Bay development.
- (10) Provide through bicycle/pedestrian connection from San Leandro Bay Regional Shoreline to proposed Oyster Bay Regional Shoreline in San Leandro.
- (11) A shoreline trail from the existing San Leandro Marina Park south along the levee to San Lorenzo.
- (12) A connection between Highway 92, in the vicinity of the Oliver Brothers Salt Works, to the north bank of Old Alameda Creek, generally following the inboard dike system.
- (13) A route along the north bank of Old Alameda Creek, connecting the route (described in 12, above) and the tidal gate dike at Union City (Alvarado).
- (14) A connection between the tidal gate dike and the north bank of the Alameda Creek Flood Control Channel, following inboard dikes and routes proposed by the East Bay Regional Park District.

- (15) The inboard trails between the Refuge headquarters and Drawbridge proposed by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service in the Refuge Master Plan, to the extent compatible with salt production operations.

d. Overall Conclusion

Because of the continuing need for public access and recreation in urban areas, the cities of Oakland and Alameda should pursue every opportunity of providing and enhancing visual and physical access to the Bay. Street rights-of-way ending at or passing parallel to the Bay should be "opened-up" to the water and provided with basic public amenities such as benches, trash cans, drinking fountains, etc.

6. Santa Clara County

a. Specific Findings

- (1) Santa Clara County's 47-mile frontage on San Francisco Bay begins in the south at the easternmost point of Newby Island along the south bank of Coyote Creek. The area of this shoreline, described by the unnamed tributary to Coyote Creek, the southern shoreline of Coyote Creek, and the eastern bank of Alviso Slough, is designated as the major Santa Clara County portion of the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. The Refuge Master Plan proposes extensive trails for controlled public access around the periphery of this area that will have the potential to connect with the Coyote Creek Park Chain and the East Bay Regional Park trail system.
- (2) The old port of Alviso has been designated a National Historic District and is the site of a visitor center for the Wildlife Refuge. The Alviso Marina with its small boat launch ramp is the only point of Bay public access within the city limits of San Jose.
- (3) The County of Santa Clara and the City of Sunnyvale have acquired a total of 35<sup>4</sup> acres on or near a sanitary landfill at the head (end) of Guadalupe Slough, for the creation of the Sunnyvale-Baylands Regional Park complex. When developed for park purposes the raised fill areas will provide views of the Slough.

- (4) All of the shoreline between the proposed Sunnyvale Park and Stevens Creek is occupied by active salt evaporating ponds and several wastewater aeration ponds, which, in turn, are adjacent to Moffett Field. The 55-acre Crittenden Salt Marsh, along the east bank of Stevens Creek, is intended for acquisition from Leslie Salt Company by the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District. The City of Mountain View, Santa Clara County, and the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District are coordinating the development of a trail plan along Stevens Creek to the Bay.
- (5) The shoreline between Stevens Creek and Charleston Slough is also occupied by salt evaporating ponds and tidal marshes. However, the sanitary landfill are directly south of the ponds at the head of Mountain View Slough will ultimately be developed by the City of Mountain View into the 700-acre Mountain View Shoreline Regional Park. Moffett Field poses the only potential major obstacle to provision of a continuous public trail system linking all existing and proposed public parks and wildlife refuges in the Baylands of Santa Clara County. A continuous Baylands trail system is only possible at Moffett Field with the cooperation of the Navy.
- (6) The Palo Alto Baylands Nature Interpretive Center, with its network of trails along dikes and boardwalks, provides the only improved public access to the Santa Clara County portion of the Bay. This center is part of the 1,800-acre Byxbee Park which includes the adjacent flood basin and proposed nature study area, the Yacht Harbor (leased by the City to the County), small boat launching ramp, duck pond and lagoon, and other facilities. The final Palo Alto Baylands Master Plan, prepared pursuant to a condition of a BCDC permit for dredging of the Yacht Harbor, when adopted, will provide for a number of trails and other public access improvements in the park area. The nearby Palo Alto Flood Basin, is one of the few areas along Highway 101 where the traveler has any view of natural marsh vegetation.

b. Exceptional Shoreline Sites

The following sites would provide exceptional opportunities for additional public access:

- (1) The trail proposed by the County Planning Policy Committee between the Alviso District and the proposed Sunnyvale Baylands Park, along Alviso Slough and the inboard salt pond dikes.
- (2) A connection utilizing the most feasible route as determined by the Navy and other appropriate agencies, between the Sunnyvale Baylands Park and Stevens Creek. The site is under control of the Navy and access may pose certain hazards to the public.
- (3) The trail proposed by County Planning Policy Committee and the City of Mountain View along the inboard dikes at the north edge of Mountain View Shoreline Regional Park, between Stevens Creek and Palo Alto.
- (4) The alignment considered for implementation by the Department of Parks and Recreation and included in the Baylands Master Plan along the upland edge of the Palo Alto Flood Basin between Mountain View and the existing trail system in Byxbee Park, including the bridge extensions at Adobe Creek and Matadero Creek.

c. Important Sites

The following sites are also extremely important for public access, particularly since they would provide for a variety of shoreline experience and access continuity along the Bay:

- (1) The peripheral trail system proposed in the Refuge Master Plan for the Alviso Unit of the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge.
- (2) A spur trail adjacent to the Sunnyvale Baylands Park utilizing existing outboard dikes to Guadalupe Slough.
- (3) The proposed trail along the west bank of Stevens Creek between the Bay and Mountain View.
- (4) A spur trail north of Mountain View Shoreline Regional Park to the Bay along the west bank of Mountain View Slough.

7. San Mateo County

a. Specific Findings

- (1) San Mateo County fronts on approximately 105 miles of San Francisco Bay. Between the county line at San Francisquito Creek and Cooley Landing, the County Bay frontage is characterized by the extensive tidal marshes of the Faber and Laumeister Tracts. Cooley Landing, an historic landing area located near the original shoreline as it existed in 1850, provides outstanding panoramic views of the South Bay area. Plans of the City of Menlo Park propose preservation and open space for the two marsh tracts. San Mateo County proposes that the Cooley Landing area become a public marina and park development.
- (2) The shoreline between Cooley Landing and Ravenswood Slough is characterized by extensive dikes, salt ponds, an island, and outboard tidal marshes. The Dumbarton Bridge and its approaches dominate this area. The area between the railroad causeway and the salt evaporating ponds to the north near the Hetch Hetchy Aqueduct is proposed as a wildlife refuge and nature study area by the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District.
- (3) As a result of the BCDC permit issued to the Department of Transportation for the construction of the new Dumbarton Bridge, a portion of the old bridge will be retained as a fishing pier if an appropriate management agency can be found. Also, as a condition of the permit, a diked parcel that can be restored as a tidal marsh must be provided as mitigation somewhere in the West Bay area. The Willow Road bridge approach passes directly adjacent to Ravenswood Slough, a healthy tidal marsh.
- (4) By taking advantage of the height provided by the sanitary landfill, the Marsh Road Bayfront Park, proposed by the City of Menlo Park, will provide both panoramic views of the Bay and recreational facilities.
- (5) The public marina at Redwood City offers the first improved area for public access along the County shoreline. Some additional public access

has been provided nearby pursuant to BCDC permits. The remainder of this Bay frontage on Redwood Creek is occupied by various port and industrial uses, and the visually prominent Leslie Salt stockpile. The point at the junction of Westpoint Slough and Redwood Creek offers views of the Bay and channel traffic. Most of this area, including the salt ponds to the east, has been the subject of a special study prepared by the Port of Redwood City, the City of Redwood City, and BCDC.

- (6) As a result of agreements between Mobil Oil Estates and the State of California, the important wildlife habitat of the Bair Island area surrounded by Steinberger and Corkscrew Sloughs and Redwood Creek, will be retained as open space and/or tidal marshes. A number of other areas on Bair Island, including the one surrounded by Deepwater Slough, are habitat for such rare and endangered species as the salt marsh harvest mouse and clapper rail. Portions of Corkscrew Slough are hauling grounds for the harbor seal.
- (7) A portion of salt pond, "Pond A-12", bounded by Smith and Steinberger Sloughs and Redwood Creek, is proposed as the site of a private marina. Access along Redwood Creek between Smith Slough and the Creek to the city center is blocked by the low-level freeway bridge. The views of the tidal marshes and wildlife in the upper end of Steinberger Slough, along nearly a mile of Bayshore Freeway near Whipple Avenue, are impaired by a number of large roadside billboards.
- (8) As a result of BCDC permits, peripheral access is provided around the peninsula at Redwood Shores along the existing dike top. Three public access connection points between the public streets and the perimeter dike will be provided pursuant to BCDC permits. Though fronting on several thousand feet of Belmont Slough, Marine World/Africa USA, a commercial theme park, provides no public access to the Bay. Views of the upper end of Belmont Slough from the freeway are blocked by the elevated land fill for the City of Belmont baseball field.
- (9) Substantial public access has been provided by the City of Foster City to the outer end of Belmont Slough and along nearly two miles of open

Bay as a paved pathway on top of the perimeter dike. However, the Foster City shoreline pathway system is blocked by the fencing and approaches of the San Mateo Bridge. Safe pedestrian access across Highway 92 to the north shore of Foster City can now only be achieved by utilizing city streets and the Foster City Boulevard overcrossing, nearly one mile west. The north shore, while not improved for access, is available and planned for that use.

- (10) A current project underway by the City of San Mateo will provide a pathway connection between the Foster City shoreline and the San Mateo Shoreline Park (under construction) across the dike separating Seal Slough (Mariner Lagoon) from the Bay. The San Mateo Shoreline Park will utilize the elevated sanitary landfill area to the east of San Mateo Creek and the extensive bayfront dike between the Creek and Coyote Point Park.
- (11) The Coyote Point Marina and County Park, operated by the County Parks and Recreation Department, provides the most attractive public access improvements along the County's shore. In addition to the Marina and usual park facilities (picnic tables, playfields, trails, etc.), the north shore area is one of only two public beaches in the West Bay.
- (12) The City of Burlingame proposes an improved public access pathway system around the east and north edges of the Anza-Pacific fill where de facto access now exists. Public access improvements already provided by the City include Fisherman's Park (a fishing pier and area with picnic tables) and the shoreline strip along the south edge of the fill adjacent to Burlingame Channel which connects to the shoreline trail along Airport Boulevard at the north edge of the fill. Continued shoreline access to the northwest towards the airport is interrupted by a variety of existing commercial and industrial uses including offices, restaurants, service stations, and a hotel, which obstruct access to and views of the Bay from Bayshore Highway.
- (13) The open area provided by Mills Creek at the Bayshore Highway crossing is an important view corridor to the Bay. Pursuant to conditions of BCDC permits, improved public access has been

provided as part of the various restaurant projects on either side of Mills Creek. The City of Burlingame proposes to connect these areas with a pedestrian/bicycle bridge across the Creek. De facto access continues from the restaurant area along the shoreline. The parking lot at the foot of Millbrae Avenue serves as an important view corridor with views of the Bay and airport operations.

- (14) The San Francisco International Airport and its various ancillary operations effectively blocks the continuation of any access either along the Bay or inland to the north. A large undeveloped strip of land just west of the Bayshore Freeway is owned by the Airport and currently utilized as a power line transmission corridor by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company. By utilizing existing street overcrossings at Millbrae Avenue and San Bruno Avenue and this undeveloped strip, pedestrian/bicycle access around the airport operations appears feasible.
- (15) The Bay shoreline along the north edge of the airport, around the mouth of the San Bruno Channel and Colma Creek, and north to Point San Bruno offers outstanding opportunities for attractive public access, with views of the Central Bay, airport operations, and the San Mateo Bridge. The marshes and mudflats around the perimeter of Belle Air Island (a peninsula) are important feeding and resting areas for shorebirds and waterfowl. The City of South San Francisco proposes that nearly all of this shoreline become public access.
- (16) Pursuant to the conditions of a BCDC permit, Point San Bruno and approximately 2,000 feet of shoreline to the north, are to be improved and set aside for public access. A connection to the enlarged Oyster Point Marina is planned. Marina expansion plans also provide for other recreational improvements including a fishing pier and complete shoreline access. The public beach in the west basin is the second of two such beaches in the West Bay.
- (17) Portions of the shore of Oyster Point, north of the Marina, are planned for public access. Approximately 1,500 feet of shoreline in the area



have been or will be provided for public access through the BCDC permit process. Because of intervening industrial uses, a continuation of public access around the remainder of the shore is not feasible. However, the north shore of the cove area from the U. S. Steel facility to the Brisbane city limit is both feasible and desirable for public access.

- (18) According to the City of Brisbane Waterfront Plan, the Brisbane portion of the Sierra Point sanitary landfill is scheduled for development within five years as a commercial retail/office/recreational complex with a 600-berth marina. Fisherman's Park, with a fishing pier and bicycle path, is proposed for the entire two-mile Bay frontage along the Bayshore Freeway connecting to the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area to the north. Implementation of these park plans is dependent upon continued cooperation between the City, Department of Transportation, Department of Parks and Recreation, the County Parks and Recreation Department, and BCDC. Any structures or development along the causeway should recognize the value of the freeway as an important visual access corridor to the Bay.

b. Exceptional Shoreline Sites

The following sites provide exceptional opportunities for additional public access:

- (1) A continuous pathway system from the County line at San Francisquito Creek to the Marsh Road Bayfront Park in Menlo Park, including the following:
- (a) A dike-top trail passing inboard of Faber and Laumeister Tracts, thence north past the island salt pond to the railroad causeway, with a connection to Cooley Landing.
  - (b) A loop trail around the large salt pond south of the Dumbarton Bridge approach, incorporating the public access along the approach road provided as part of the bridge replacement project.
  - (c) A connection along the south bank of Ravenswood Slough to the tide gate, thence west along the inboard salt pond dikes to Marsh Road Bayfront Park.

- (2) A public view area near the confluence of Westpoint Slough and Redwood Creek, within the Port of Redwood City, overlooking the port activities and channel traffic.
- (3) A continuation of the shoreline pathway system in Foster City along Belmont Slough thence west to Seal Slough (Mariner Lagoon).
- (4) A continuation of the Foster City path system along the dike tops, under the San Mateo Bridge, thence along the north shore to the San Mateo connection at Seal Slough (Mariner Lagoon).
- (5) The San Mateo shoreline path from the mouth of Seal Slough (Mariner Lagoon) to Coyote Point County Park along the top of the dike.
- (6) The remainder of the perimeter of the landfill in Burlingame between Coyote Point Park and the new shoreline trail along Airport Boulevard.
- (7) A continuous shoreline pathway between Airport Boulevard and Millbrae Avenue, including a pedestrian/bicycle bridge at Mills Creek.
- (8) The shoreline, in South San Francisco, from and including Belle Air Island to Colma Creek, thence along the north shore of the Creek to Point San Bruno and the connection to the Oyster Point Marina.
- (9) The perimeter of the Sierra Point landfill, in South San Francisco and Brisbane.
- (10) The Fisherman's Park pathway system north from Sierra Point to the San Francisco county line and Candlestick Point State Recreation Area.

c. Important Sites

The following sites are also extremely important for public access, particularly since they would provide for a variety of shoreline experience and access continuity along the Bay:

- (1) When no longer needed for the storage and shipment of salt, the perimeter of the Leslie Salt stockpile area along Redwood Creek.
- (2) The perimeter of "Pond A-12" adjacent to the Whipple Avenue interchange in Redwood City.

- (3) Extension of the existing path system on the dike top along Steinberger Slough to the perimeter of the San Carlos Airport (Holly Street).
- (4) A connection between the Millbrae and South San Francisco shorelines, utilizing existing walkways along street overcrossing at Millbrae and San Bruno Avenue and the undeveloped land strip just west of the Bayshore Freeway, along the original Bay shoreline.
- (5) Additional public access sites around Oyster Point, and the pathway system necessary for continuity from Oyster Point to Sierra Point, utilizing Oyster Point Boulevard and the railroad right-of-way.

8. San Francisco City and County

a. Specific Findings

- (1) The City and County of San Francisco occupies 30 miles of Bay shoreline, from the San Mateo county line to Lands End (end of BCDC jurisdiction), including Treasure, Yerba Buena, Alcatraz, and portions of Red Rock Islands. The City has a resident population of 685,000; however, another 240,000 people work in the City and utilize its resources, including the waterfront. The City's largest industry, tourism, attracts over two million visitors annually.
- (2) The entire Port of San Francisco area from Hyde Street to India Basin is subject to the policies and maps of Special Area Plan No. 1: San Francisco Waterfront. This plan was prepared by a diverse community-based committee at BCDC's request. Adopted by BCDC on April 17, 1975, the Plan provides the Commission with policy guidance on filling, dredging, and changes in use that may occur within the Plan area. As an amendment to the Bay Plan, it is also consistent with the City's Plan for the Northeastern Waterfront which encompasses most of this area, as well as Aquatic-Victorian Park.
- (3) The section of City shoreline between the San Mateo county line and Hunters Point Naval Shipyard will become part of the 125-acre Candlestick Point State Recreation Area that will

provide improved public access to the Bay in this area. According to the San Francisco Department of City Planning, the nearby Hunters Point and Bayview residential districts are "high need neighborhoods" that should be given priority for new parks and recreation improvements. The City proposes the shoreline park be expanded along the south shore of Hunters Point.

- (4) An outstanding panoramic view of the Bay and shipyard activity exists at the parking lot above the old Naval Administration building within the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. The vantage point is outside the prime activity zone of the shipyard.
- (5) The shoreline of India Basin, also adjacent to a high need neighborhood, is largely undeveloped. The irregular shore is characterized by rip rap banks, mudflats, small pickleweed marshes, a sand beach, small boat yards, random housing, the warm water outfall of the Hunters Point Pacific Gas and Electric Power Plant, and the edge of the Pier 98 fill area. The shoreline near the outfall is used extensively for fishing. Panoramic views of the Basin and the Central Bay are seen from Hunters Point Boulevard which rims the southwest shoreline. Both the Special Area Plan and City plans propose that the Basin be developed into a major waterfront park featuring continuous shoreline access along the southwest edge of Pier 98 and along the Basin, with a connection between the two areas.
- (6) The two small public access points east of the 3rd Street Bridge on either bank of the Islais Creek Channel provide views of the active port operations at Piers 80 and 92 (the Port grain terminal). The south bank of the channel west of the bridge is designated by the Special Area Plan for future public access and waterfront recreation.
- (7) A small waterfront park is being built by the Port of San Francisco at the end of 24th Street at Warm Water Cove. A fishing pier has been provided by Pacific Gas and Electric Company as a condition to a BCDC permit for work at the nearby Potrero Power Plant. The Special Area Plan designates the park as well as public access along the north edge of the Cove.

- (8) The shoreline adjacent to the Potrero Power Plant at the end of 23rd Street, near the original Potrero Point shoreline of 1853, is a de facto fishing site adjacent to the warm water outfall at the power plant unit.
- (9) The maritime and industrial uses of the shoreline between the Potrero Power Plant and Central Basin, including the historic Bethlehem Steel shipyards, are generally incompatible with public access.
- (10) Aqua Vista Park and Fishing Pier on China Basin Street, provided by the Port as a condition to a BCDC permit, is an important public access area which has opened up nearly 400 feet of shoreline and provides views of both small boat berthing at Mission Rock Resort and the activities of the nearby Bethlehem Steel Shipbuilding Yards. Both the Special Area Plan and City plans propose that the Central Basin area continue to be developed for public access and waterfront recreation.
- (11) The boat launch ramp immediately adjacent to the Santa Fe Railroad ferry slip and decrepit wharves at Pier 52 is the only public launching facility in the City.
- (12) An opportunity for views of the entire Central Bay at the corner of China Basin Street (adjacent to China Basin Channel) is blocked by a small industrial storage tank facility. Views of the Channel are generally available from both banks west of the 3rd Street Bascule Bridge to the end, near 7th Street. Improved public access will be provided adjacent to the rehabilitated Mission Creek Harbor along the south bank. The deck of the China Basin Building is open for public access during regular business hours pursuant to a BCDC permit. Both the Special Area Plan and City plans propose that continuous public access be provided around the entire Channel west of Third Street.
- (13) The area from China Basin Channel north to the Bay Bridge is characterized by a mixture of maritime uses and non-maritime uses, such as recreational vehicle storage. The openings between these piers now offer the opportunity for both fishing and view access of the Bay.

- (14) With the assistance of a grant from the Economic Development Administration, the Port of San Francisco will provide an improved pedestrian promenade with split-level walkways, view areas, and a fishing pier from Pier 22 north to the Agriculture Building, at the foot of Mission Street. A major project feature will be the development and enhancement of the Folsom Street view corridor.
- (15) Public access in the Ferry Building area is limited to minor improvements at Sinbad's Restaurant, the recently opened Ferry Terminal for the Larkspur Ferry with its second level viewing deck on the BART platform, and the access around the Sausalito/Tiburon Ferry landing, immediately north of the Ferry Building. Parking, fences and other inappropriate uses and structures detract from Bay views in this area. The Embarcadero roadway and the Embarcadero Freeway physically and visually separate the waterfront from the rest of the City in this area. The Port, Department of City Planning, and Redevelopment Agency are coordinating on development plans for the entire area between Piers 7 and 46A which will give high priority to public access. The plans are to be developed pursuant to a Total Design Plan as specified by the Special Area Plan.
- (16) Except for a couple of minor passageways through bulkhead buildings, there is no view of the Bay between the Sausalito/Tiburon Ferry landing and Pier 7. The exposed parking lot on Pier 7 detracts from the view corridor at the foot of Broadway. The end of Pier 7 has been developed and is used heavily for fishing. Other openings which provide opportunities for visual and fishing access to the Bay exist between Piers 7 and 9, 9 and 15, 17 and 19, 23 and 27, and 31 and 33. Any future development of this area of other than maritime uses will necessitate the preparation of a separate Total Design Plan as specified by the Special Area Plan. Regardless of future uses, the Special Area Plan specifies public access for this area.
- (17) The area between the passenger ship terminal at Piers 33-35 and Pier 41, known as Pier 39, has been developed as a commercial recreation

facility. Pursuant to the terms and conditions of the BCDC permit issued for this project, continuous public access has been provided around the entire periphery of the enlarged pier. In addition, the developer is providing a waterfront park (North Point Park) along The Embarcadero between Pier 37 and 41. Access for viewing and fishing will also be provided on the breakwater being built to replace Pier 41.

- (18) Because of various mixed uses, public access on Pier 45 is not generally available. Outstanding views of Alcatraz, Angel Island, and the Golden Gate are available from the end of the pier. The Special Area Plan specifies that regardless of the type of future development, the entire periphery of the pier should be available for public access.
- (19) For all of its use and reputation as a tourist attraction, the Fisherman's Wharf area provides very little in the way of improved public access to the Bay. Even though most of the popular restaurants and other attractions are within a hundred feet of the Bay, views of the Bay are confined to the congested 300-foot frontage of Jefferson Street on Wharf J-5 and the openings between Piers 41 and 45. Additional public access with some benches is available on the various J Wharves west of Taylor; however, the casual visitor would find access unclear or blocked by buildings, parked cars and trucks, lockers, and other obstructions. The area in front of these restaurants and even to the Bay edge, as at Pier 43-1/2, is dominated by automobiles, both moving and parked. Pedestrian access along the Jefferson Street frontage is confined to a narrow passageway between a railing on one side and benches, planters, and parked cars on the other (total walkway width with benches and planters is 12 feet). Pedestrian access west to the Hyde Street Pier is restricted to the Jefferson Street sidewalks. The Special Area Plan and City plans for the area propose improvements which would enhance public access and the commercial fishing aspects of the Wharf while retaining and upgrading commercial recreation uses.

- (20) The entire northern shoreline from the Hyde Street Pier (historic ships) west to the Pacific Ocean is part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Outstanding pedestrian/bicycle access to the Bay is provided by the Golden Gate Promenade which runs the entire length of the shore to historic Fort Point beneath the Golden Gate Bridge. As a result of sewer construction in this area, the railroad tracks between the Fort Mason tunnel and Baker Street have been removed. These tracks, which connect the entire waterfront to the Southern Pacific Depot, will be replaced upon completion of the sewer project; however, their future use is uncertain. Use of these tracks for improved mass transit along the waterfront to Crissy Field has been proposed in a number of planning documents and is supported by the National Park Service and the Municipal Railway.
- (21) The view area overlooking the Bay near the toll plaza of the Golden Gate Bridge is one of the most popular vista points in the entire Bay area. However, vegetation around the parking lots obstructs additional Bay views, particularly to the east.
- (22) West of the Bridge public access to the Bay is limited because of the cliffs and rocks along much of this shoreline. Improved public beach access, as part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, is available at Bakers Beach and James D. Phelan Beach.
- (23) Alcatraz Island, another Golden Gate Recreation Area unit, rates as one of the most popular visitor attractions in the entire National Park System. Access to the island is provided by commercial ferry boats leaving from Pier 43-1/2 in the Fisherman's Wharf area.
- (24) Both Yerba Buena Island, an original Bay island, and Treasure Island, a landfill placed in 1937 for the World's Fair site, are under the control of the U. S. Navy. Though vehicles have access to the islands from the Bay Bridge, access to the shoreline is subject to Navy control. Public access to the Navy Museum by private automobile or A-C Transit is through Yerba Buena Island, and the access road affords spectacular views. The



views of the San Francisco skyline and the Bay Bridge are particularly outstanding from the heights (elevation 338') and rocky bluffs of Yerba Buena Island. With some minor improvements, those portions of the island not used for housing and operation areas could be utilized for public access.

b. Exceptional Shoreline Sites

The following sites provide exceptional opportunities for additional public access:

- (1) An improved continuous pathway system with fishing pier(s) around the entire periphery of India Basin.
- (2) Additional access improvements along Islais Creek, especially on the south bank, west of the 3rd Street Bridge.
- (3) Completion of the proposed park at Warm Water Cove, with additional access along the north bank to 23rd Street.
- (4) Continued enlargement and improvement of public access in Central Basin.
- (5) Peripheral access around China Basin Channel, west of Third Street, and an enlarged site on the south bank, extending from Third Street east to the Bay.
- (6) A developed pedestrian promenade with overlooks, park and plaza spaces, benches, and other appropriate facilities extending along The Embarcadero from Pier 46A to Fisherman's Wharf, consistent with maritime uses.
- (7) Provision of pedestrian-oriented public access to the Bay in the Fisherman's Wharf area, with an appropriate connection to Aquatic Park.

c. Important Sites

The following sites are also extremely important for public access, particularly since they would provide for a variety of shoreline experience and access continuity along the Bay:

- (1) Implementation of the plans for Candlestick Point State Recreation Area, with an enlargement along the south shore of Hunters Point.
- (2) To the extent consistent with security and operational restrictions, a beach and a public view area within the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard.
- (3) Enlargement and improvement of the public boat launch facility at Pier 52.
- (4) To the extent consistent with public safety and security restrictions, improved public access on Yerba Buena and Treasure Islands. The site is under control of the Navy and access may pose certain hazards to the public.
- (5) Use of the railroad tracks for public transit in the Marina Green area, providing additional access between Fort Mason and Crissy Field.

d. Overall Conclusion

Because of San Francisco's population density and unique setting on the Bay, the staff has concluded that every possibility for additional improved public access to the Bay, both visual and physical, should be vigorously pursued. In many cases, such as between piers, improved access can be provided by the removal of parked cars, fences, and other obstructions.

---

## PART II: THE APPEARANCE AND DESIGN ELEMENT

---

This element consists of findings and conclusions recommending changes to the Public Access and Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views sections of the San Francisco Bay Plan. In addition, general guidelines for the development of public access in various kinds of Bay projects are identified and illustrated. (NOTE: The text of Bay Plan policies amended by the Commission is located in Appendix A.)

### A. Recommended Bay Plan Changes

#### 1. Findings

- a. San Francisco Bay remains the single most prominent visual resource in the Bay region. It serves as an orientation element and geographical focal point for residents and visitors alike. The importance of the Bay and its shoreline as a visual resource is stated in the San Francisco Bay Plan Findings on Public Access and Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views.
- b. Although opportunities for public viewing and appreciation of the Bay have increased since the Bay Plan was adopted in 1968, there is still a significant number of shoreline areas where there is little or no visual access to the Bay from nearby public areas. In some areas, the Bay cannot be seen because of the flat terrain or other topographic constraints. In other areas, notably those along a number of urban waterfronts, visual access is limited by man-placed constructions such as buildings, parking lots, fences, billboards, and landscaping which have eliminated or severely detracted from views of the Bay.
- c. The most attractive and well-used public access areas obtained through the BCDC permit process are those which provide visual as well as physical access, provide connections to public rights-of-way, are related to adjacent uses, and are designed, improved, and maintained so as to give the appearance of clearly being public areas and thus invite access by potential users.

- d. Attractive public access areas provided as an integral part of shoreline projects, particularly commercial facilities such as restaurants, shops, and plazas, enhance the experience of both the shoreline visitor and project user, including the customer, employee, and resident.
- e. The existing Bay Plan Policies on Public Access and Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views are inter-related and should be so considered when determining the adequacy of public access of any shoreline project provided through the permit process. Maximum feasible public access consistent with the project should provide physical access to and along the Bay, include attractive and well-designed improvements, and provide visual access to the Bay. Additional criteria and design guidelines are needed to assist designers and developers in the planning design of projects along the shoreline as recommended by Bay Plan Public Access Policy No. 9.
- f. In some cases, project uses, environmental constraints, or uses on adjacent areas may conflict with the goal of providing maximum feasible public access. Examples include sensitive wildlife areas where uncontrolled public intrusion may significantly decrease the wildlife values; or certain port or water-related industrial activities such as ship loading, boat/ship repair, hazardous product transfer, or similar activities which may endanger public access users.

## 2. Conclusions

- a. The Bay Plan Findings and Policies on Public Access should be amended to specify that maximum feasible public access to the Bay and its shoreline include visual as well as physical access.
- b. The Bay Plan Findings and Policies on Public Access (Policy No. 9) should be amended to refer to the Public Access Design Guidelines manual developed to assist developers and designers of shoreline projects and public access sites. The manual contains more detailed appearance and design and public access guidelines, which will assist developers, staff, the Commission's Design

Review Board, and the Commission in carrying out the policies of the San Francisco Bay Plan. The proposed guidelines are attached.

- c. The Bay Plan Policies on Appearance and Design (Policy No. 1) should be amended to refer to the Public Access Design Guidelines manual as well as the Bay Plan's General Development Guide.
- d. The Bay Plan Findings and Policies on Public Access should include a reference to the Design Review Board and its advisory role to the Commission in evaluating projects for maximum feasible public access consistent with Bay and shoreline projects.
- e. The Bay Plan Policies on Public Access should be amended to provide for those rare situations where public access at the location of a specific project may be difficult or impossible to achieve because of possible jeopardy to wildlife values or to the safety of public access users.

#### B. Public Access Design Guidelines

Because of its importance in the Commission's consideration of Bay and shoreline projects, the concept of public access should be integrated into the overall project design program at an early stage so as to be an essential part of the project and not appear as an afterthought.

##### 1. Providing Public Access in Shoreline Projects

The type of access and level of improvements and maintenance should relate not only to the particular locale but also to the nature and extent of the project requiring a BCDC permit. In general, because of population demand for waterfront access, projects within urban areas should provide more improvements than those in isolated and less frequently used rural areas.

Public access and project improvements should generally conform to land uses and locations. Generally the project designer should:

##### a. Water-Related Industrial/Port Uses

- (1) Provide point access or view area(s) with piers, towers, or other structures which offer safe views of both the Bay and the particular activity where potential safety hazards or use conflicts may occur.

- (2) Provide other improvements, such as parking, benches, paved walkways, signs, landscaping, etc., that are appropriate for the project size, location, and the amount of shoreline affected.

b. Commercial Uses (Restaurants, Shops, Theaters, etc., which Cater to the Public)

- (1) Provide for the maximum amount of highly improved public access because these types of projects are capable of exposing large numbers of people to the Bay and benefit the most from well designed and improved public shoreline areas.
- (2) Provide the maximum amount of shoreline access, unless the overall project design, in the Design Review Board's opinion, would be improved by occasional detours inland. Provide for continuous access through the site and provide public areas that are large enough so as not to interfere with commercial operations.
- (3) Take advantage of the shoreline setting, by relating the development to the Bay. Locate uses that do not relate to the Bay well back from the shoreline to minimize adverse impacts.
- (4) Provide public access improvements such as parking, paved walkways, benches, signs, trash containers, landscaping, lighting, restrooms, and drinking fountains, where the costs of the improvements are reasonably related to the private benefits of the shoreline use.

c. Water-Related Recreation and Marina Uses

- (1) Provide the greatest amount of improved or natural public access to and along the Bay shoreline.
- (2) Create some variety in the public access experience by providing pedestrian spaces or nodes, especially in marina projects which are often linear in nature.

- (3) Provide public access for fishing wherever possible on piers and breakwaters.
- (4) Provide public boat launching ramps wherever possible, in conformance with Bay Plan policies.

d. Residential Uses

- (1) Provide substantial improved shoreline access or park/open space adjacent to the Bay to serve the general public and project residents.
- (2) Take advantage of the setting, to the maximum extent feasible, by orienting the project to Bay views and otherwise providing the residents and public with reminders of the proximity of the Bay.
- (3) Provide unobtrusive paths to or along the shoreline that respect the residents' privacy to encourage passive public use where appropriate as part of individual residences.
- (4) Develop multi-family and multiple unit projects with all-weather paths, landscaping, and other improvements that are appropriate for the anticipated demand, and size and location of the project. The public access system should generally provide continuous access along the shoreline with connection to other public areas or streets. Provide public parking if none exists in the area.
- (5) Use elevational changes, planting, fences, and signs to clearly differentiate the public access areas from the private residential areas.

e. Other Urban Uses

- (1) Set uses that do not relate to the Bay, e.g. light industrial uses, offices, and parking, well back from the shoreline.
- (2) Provide maximum access along the shoreline and screen the shoreline from incompatible uses.

- (3) Place improvements, such as landscaping, benches, paving, etc., that are appropriate for the anticipated demand, and size and location of the project.

f. Uses in or Adjacent to Marshes, Mudflats, Salt Ponds, Agricultural Areas, Wildlife Areas, or Wetlands in Typically Non-Urban Areas

- (1) Develop or provide public access in these areas, if appropriate, only in a way that respects and enhances the natural values.
- (2) Provide point access (e.g. spur trails) or view areas rather than continuous shoreline paths. Provide controls to protect wildlife resources or other features from any access into these areas.
- (3) Provide minimal improvements such as trash containers and signs which identify the area and interpret the resources.
- (4) Encourage supervised interpretive use of sensitive resource areas.

2. The Design of Public Access

All public access provided through the Commission permit process should be planned, designed, executed, and maintained on the basis of the following fundamental principles of public access. Public access should:

- Feel public.
- Be usable by the greatest number and diversity of people, including the physically handicapped.
- Provide, maintain, and enhance visual access.
- Enhance and maintain the visual quality of the shoreline.
- Connect to public areas or thoroughfares, or other public access areas.
- Take advantage of the Bay setting.
- Be compatible with the natural features of the shoreline, the project, and adjacent development.



a. Making Public Access "Public"

- (1) Design public access so that the user is not intimidated nor his appreciation restricted by large building masses, structures, or incompatible uses.
- (2) Clearly delineate the public use areas by the use of signs, planting, fences, or elevational changes where private or conflicting uses may exist as part of the project.
- (3) Identify public access sites with a standard "Public Shore" sign both on site and at nearest public thoroughfare.

b. Making Public Access Usable

- (1) Take advantage of intrinsic recreational capabilities, such as fishing, viewing, or picnicking, that are consistent with the site and adjacent sites.
- (2) Provide basic public amenities such as benches, paths, trash containers, drinking fountains, lighting, and restrooms where appropriate.
- (3) Provide for easy site maintenance with durable materials, drought-resistant and saline tolerant plant materials, and similar measures.
- (4) Reasonably maintain the public access area (litter pick-up, safety hazards removed, etc.) regularly.
- (5) Place and design buildings and other structures to provide for maximum sunlight and usable open space.
- (6) Provide public parking where appropriate to serve the site, but keep parking areas small, away from the Bay, and adequately screened.
- (7) Provide some small bayside parking areas or pull-offs for limited in-car Bay viewing where compatible with existing roads and adjacent uses.

- (8) Provide attractive screen planting or devices to shield users from incompatible uses, excessive winds, or undesirable noises.
- (9) Provide facilities for the physically handicapped to the maximum extent possible.
- (10) Where appropriate, provide educational opportunities for the user through identification of unique natural features and historical landmarks.

c. Providing, Maintaining, and Enhancing Visual Access to the Bay and the Shoreline

- (1) Design public access areas to be visible from both public thoroughfares and the Bay.
- (2) Locate buildings, structures, parking lots, and landscaping of new shoreline projects so as not to obstruct or detract from views of the Bay from nearby public thoroughfares.
- (3) Cluster shoreline development to allow Bay views and access between building clusters.
- (4) In hilly areas, design and locate shoreline buildings so as to allow for upland views of the Bay and Bay access areas.
- (5) Control landscaping to preserve and dramatize Bay views, especially in sideyards, at street ends, and along public thoroughfares.
- (6) Design developments near the junction of waterways and the Bay to preserve views to the Bay along the waterway.
- (7) Plan roads to keep Bay and Bay access areas in view as much as possible, especially where roads change direction.
- (8) Employ split-level lanes to increase viewing and landscaping potential.
- (9) Design guardrails to allow maximum views, especially on bridges.

d. Maintaining and Enhancing the Visual Quality of the Bay and the Shoreline

- (1) Utilize the shoreline for Bay-related uses; uses that do not orient to the Bay should be set well back from and not impact on the shoreline.
- (2) Design shoreline development so as to maintain and enhance the visual quality of the shoreline.
- (3) Use forms, materials, colors, and textures that are compatible with the Bay and adjacent development.
- (4) Locate buildings, structures, parking lots, and landscaping of new shoreline projects so as not to obstruct or detract from views of the Bay from nearby public thoroughfares.
- (5) Control landscaping to preserve and dramatize Bay views, especially in side yards, at street ends, and along public thoroughfares.
- (6) Locate parking areas designed to meet local parking requirements adjacent to the Bay shoreline only when there is no feasible alternative location.
- (7) Locate service areas away from the shoreline or screen them from public view with suitable fencing or landscaping.

e. Connecting Public Access Areas to Other Public Access Areas and Public Thoroughfares

- (1) Connect public access with the local open space systems, school and municipal buildings, public transit systems, shopping malls, and other public spaces.
- (2) Utilize the BCDC Public Access Supplement Map to determine linkages to existing and future public access sites.
- (3) Coordinate public access with nearby park, recreation, and open space agencies to provide for connections to future trail and public

use areas that may be in the planning stage and not shown on the Public Access Supplement Map.

f. Taking Advantage of the Bay Setting

- (1) Relate all commercial facilities to the Bay. Take advantage of the setting by orienting to Bay views and providing physical and spatial connectors to the Bay at every opportunity.
- (2) Utilize the shoreline for Bay-related uses; uses that do not orient to the Bay, should be set well back from and not impact on the shoreline.
- (3) Provide elevated places for viewing the Bay.

g. Ensuring that Public Access is Compatible with the Project, Adjacent Development, and the Natural Features of the Shoreline

- (1) Provide appropriate controls for any access to or into sensitive wildlife areas.
- (2) Provide for observation and interpretation of wildlife where appropriate.
- (3) Maintain, enhance, or re-establish marsh or other natural shoreline vegetation wherever possible.
- (4) Maintain, enhance, or complement the site's natural contours, features, and plant materials.
- (5) Remove unnatural debris from shoreline access sites.
- (6) Use forms, materials, colors, and textures that are compatible with the Bay and adjacent development.
- (7) Locate and design public access so as to be consistent with the protection of fish and wildlife habitat.

---

### PART III. THE IMPLEMENTATION ELEMENT

---

The Implementation Element, based primarily on the findings and conclusions of the first two elements, recommends specific actions to be taken by the Commission or others to improve the administration of public access, provide solutions to particular access problems, and identify additional public access related issues requiring further study. The amendments to the Bay Plan Findings and Policies on Public Access and Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views, proposed in the Supplement were adopted by the Commission on April 5, 1979 (see Appendix A).

#### A. The Legal Authority for Public Access

##### 1. McAteer-Petris Act

The Commission's authority to require public access as part of development within its jurisdiction is based on the McAteer-Petris Act, primarily the legislative findings (Government Code Sections 66602 and 66602.1) and the Commission's permit authority (Government Code Section 66604). In addition, Government Code Section 66632.4 provides the Commission with specific authority to deny a permit on the basis of inadequate public access:

Within any portion or portions of the shoreline band which shall be located outside the boundaries of water-oriented priority land uses, as fixed and established pursuant to Section 66611, the commission may deny an application for a permit for a proposed project only on the grounds that the project fails to provide maximum feasible public access, consistent with the proposed project, to the bay and its shoreline.

##### 2. California Constitution

The Constitution recognizes the importance of public access to the state's navigable waters, including San Francisco Bay. Section 2 of Article Fifteen states:

No individual, partnership, or corporation, claiming or possessing the frontage or tidal lands of a harbor, bay, inlet, estuary, or other navigable water in this State, shall be

permitted to exclude the right of way to such water whenever it is required for any public purpose, nor to destroy or obstruct the free navigation of such water; and the Legislature shall enact such laws as will give the most liberal construction to this provision, so that access to the navigable waters of this State shall be always attainable for the people thereof.

This constitutional provision appears to provide an additional basis for the public access requirements of the McAteer-Petris Act. However, there may be some question whether the Act carries out the full intent of the Constitution. In any case, further investigation is needed in order to better understand the relationship between the Constitution and the McAteer-Petris Act.

### 3. Subdivision Map Act

Several sections of the Subdivision Map Act (Government Code Sections 66478.1 through 66478.14) are intended to implement the above provisions of the Constitution regarding public access to navigable waters. One section is particularly applicable to the Bay:

66478.11 Subdivision fronting on coastline or shoreline; provision for reasonable public access; access available near subdivision.

(a) No local agency shall approve either the tentative or the final map of any subdivision fronting upon the coastline or shoreline which subdivision does not provide or have available reasonable public access by fee or easement from public highways to land below the ordinary high water mark on any ocean coastline or bay shoreline within or at a reasonable distance from the subdivision.

Any public access route or routes provided by the subdivider shall be expressly designated on the tentative or final map, and such map shall expressly designate the governmental entity to which such route or routes are dedicated.

(b) Reasonable public access, as used in subdivision (a), shall be determined by the local agency in which the subdivision lies.

(c) In making the determination of what shall be reasonable public access, the local agency shall consider:

(1) That access may be by highway, foot trail, bike trail, horse trail, or any other means of travel.

(2) The size of the subdivision.

(3) The type of coastline or shoreline and the various appropriate recreational, educational, and scientific uses, including, but not limited to, diving, sunbathing, surfing, walking, swimming, fishing, beachcombing, taking of shellfish and scientific exploration.

(4) The likelihood of trespass on private property and reasonable means of avoiding such trespasses.

(d) Nothing in this section shall require a local agency to disapprove either a tentative or final map solely on the basis that the reasonable public access otherwise required by this section is not provided through or across the subdivision itself, if the local agency makes a finding that such reasonable public access is otherwise available within a reasonable distance from the subdivision.

Any such finding shall be set forth on the face of the tentative or final map.

(e) The provisions of this section shall not apply to the final map of any subdivision the tentative map of which has been approved by a local agency prior to the effective date of this section.

(f) The provisions of this section shall not apply to the final or tentative map of any subdivision which is in compliance with the plan of any planned development or any planned community which has been approved by a local agency prior to December 31, 1968. The exclusion provided by this subdivision shall be in addition to the exclusion provided by subdivision (e).

(g) Nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring the subdivider to improve any access route or routes which are primarily for the benefit of nonresidents of the subdivision area.

(h) Any access route or routes provided by the subdivider pursuant to this section may be conveyed or transferred to any state or local agency by the governmental entity to which such route or routes have been dedicated, at any future time, by mutual consent of such governmental entity and the particular state or local agency. Such conveyance or transfer shall be recorded by the recipient state or local agency in the office of the county recorder of the county in which such route or routes are located.

The Subdivision Map Act is applied generally by those local agencies that have discretionary authority over land subdivisions, and, as such, does not specifically relate to the Commission or McAteer-Petris Act. However, since the basic goals regarding public access are similar, it would appear that there is an opportunity to include the Commission in the administration of the Map Act, in so far as it relates to public access. Further study is needed of the relationship of the two acts and how they might be coordinated in order to generally improve public access to the Bay.

#### 4. Findings

- (a) Section 2 of Article Fifteen of the California Constitution recognizes the importance of public access to the state's navigable waters, including San Francisco Bay. However, the relationship between this provision and the McAteer-Petris Act is not clearly understood.
- (b) The basic goals of portions of the Subdivision Map Act and the McAteer-Petris Act with regard to public access are similar. However, the relationship of the two laws and how they might be coordinated has not been studied.

#### 5. Conclusions

- (a) The Commission should, with the advice of the State Attorney General, determine its role, if



any, within the framework of the state constitutional provision for public access to navigable waters.

- (b) The Commission, should, with the advice of the State Attorney General, study the relationship of the Subdivision Map Act and the McAteer-Petris Act to determine (1) how the two acts might be coordinated, and (2) the Commission's possible role under the Map Act in improving public access to the Bay.

## B. Changes to the Bay Plan and Commission Procedures

### 1. Amendments to the Bay Plan

In 1979, the Commission adopted amendments to the Bay Plan Findings and Policies on Public Access and on Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views, part of the Implementation Element. The findings and policies are set out in Appendix A.

### 2. The Permit Process

The permit process is the means of obtaining public access. Over time the process has been improved so that there is greater consistency in dealing with applicants and projects. However, as noted by the consultant on maintenance and security problems, there remains room for improvement. For example, the permit application form should include more specific questions relating to the public access the applicant proposes to provide and maintain. Also, the applicant should provide information on the nearest public access areas. Other recommendations are included below.

### 3. The Maintenance Issue

A report, "Security and Maintenance: The Underside of Public Access," was prepared for the Commission by Armin Rosencranz, Ph.D., in response to both Bay Plan recommendations and Commission concern with regard to the issues of maintenance, public liability, and policing (security). The consultant examined approximately 25% of the permits that had required public access in order to sample the nature and severity of any problems related to maintenance and security. In addition, he prepared a special report on the liability aspects of public access.

The consultant concluded that "maintenance, while not a major problem, is not so negligible that BCDC can ignore it." The recommendations below, if implemented, could achieve a higher level of maintenance generally.

Most maintenance problems are associated with public access areas where the permittee gains no direct economic benefit from an attractive site. That is, there is no incentive for the permittee to keep the area in an attractive condition. It has been the Commission's experience that there are fewer enforcement problems related to public access maintenance where the permittee has an economic incentive to adequately maintain the area.

Another type of maintenance problem can result from certain other types of public access required as a condition of a BCDC permit. For example, the maintenance of a bayfront dike in a rural area by a private party would need a permit in which the Commission would be required to make a finding regarding the adequacy of public access. On the basis of this Supplement and further staff advice, the Commission might find that public access should be provided. However, the nature and cost of the improvements requiring the permit might not be commensurate with the level of improvements and long-term maintenance needed for the public access. In other words, it might be unreasonable to require the private party to provide long-term public access maintenance on the basis of such a small project. Who then should assume this responsibility?

Further study into the maintenance of public access, involving the full spectrum of agencies and options, is definitely needed, particularly since reduced local agency resources will likely shift the responsibility to the private and state agency sectors. The significant findings and staff recommendations from the consultant's report are listed below.

#### 4. Additional Administrative Considerations

As noted in the introduction, the Commission, as a public agency, has an obligation to continue to inform the public with regard to the importance and status of the Bay and public access to the Bay. To this end, a free directory entitled, "Public Access and Recreation Areas," was printed and last distributed in 1976. In addition, a number of agencies and organizations have established facilities and undertaken interpretive programs to increase the public's knowledge of the Bay. These are identified in Regional Finding 7 of the Bay Shoreline Element. However, there is no up-to-date regional directory of the many places and programs that are available to inform the public with regard to San Francisco Bay.

In addition, there is a continuing need to inform other agencies of the Commission's activities and ongoing programs. To meet this need, the Commission should undertake a program to further inform and educate local agencies with regard to the BCDC public access requirements. At a minimum the completed Supplement

should be mailed with an appropriate cover letter to all agencies in the Bay Region that might have any interest or jurisdiction in the Bay. In addition, the Commission ought to conduct several public information seminars around the region to provide an informal forum for interchange of ideas between various agency representatives and the Commission staff. In addition to covering public access requirements, these seminars could be used to update local representatives on all the various programs under the Commission's authority, e.g., energy, Suisun Marsh, Bay Plan reprinting, port planning, etc.

## 5. Findings

- a. On the basis of the staff experience and the public access planning work to date there appears to be a need to amend and update the current Bay Plan Findings and Policies on Public Access and Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views.
- b. According to the consultant's study on security and maintenance, there are some maintenance problems at public access areas, mainly related to debris, trash, and weed control, that need to be addressed. The BCDC enforcement staff has not been adequate to address all of these problems. In addition, the issue of maintenance over the long term has not been resolved.
- c. The consultant also found that most maintenance problems are associated with public access areas where the permittee does not benefit directly from an attractive site, i.e., there is no incentive for the permittee to keep the site in an attractive condition.
- d. Contrary to an often expressed concern, costs related to security and maintenance are not excessive, do not drive away development within the Commission's jurisdiction, and do not cause an increase in liability insurance premiums.
- e. Although the concept of public access to the Bay is better known and defined after nearly 10 years of permit experience, there is often a lack of general public knowledge as to the importance of Bay access and of the Bay as a public resource.
- f. In certain cases, the requirement for maintenance of remote public access areas obtained through the permit process might impose an unreasonable

hardship on a private party that is performing only minor work within the Commission's jurisdiction.

- g. Existing nature education and Bay interpretive programs provide valuable information to the public regarding the importance of San Francisco Bay. Even though the number of these programs is increasing, the demand for such programs has by no means been satisfied. In addition, there is no up-to-date directory to identify all of these programs and facilities.

6. Conclusions

- a. The proposed amendments to the Bay Plan Findings and Policies on Public Access and Appearance and Design, and Scenic Views, previously submitted as part of this Implementation Element, should be adopted by the Commission.
- b. To implement the proposed Bay Plan amendments, all information to applicants, application forms, and permits should be written so that the applicant understands he or she should be prepared to provide reasonable public access improvements for the public's safety and convenience, including, where appropriate, identifying signs, trash containers, litter pick-up, and weed control. To this end, all Commission permits and approvals should carry conditions requiring these improvements and the necessary on-going maintenance where appropriate.
- c. The Commission should continue to investigate all possible methods of achieving a uniform level of maintenance at public access areas. Particular attention should be paid to (1) an incentive system for dealing with those areas where the owner operator does not benefit directly from the appearance of the public access, (2) the funding and operation of the system that may be necessary to insure the long term maintenance of public access areas that may be in remote locations and are not reasonably part of a permit condition, and (3) fulfillment of permit requirements by adequate enforcement surveillance.
- d. To implement further the public access requirement of the McAteer-Petris Act, the Commission should continue to inform the public regarding the status

and location of all shoreline access sites, including recreation and interpretive areas, by (1) periodically updating and distributing the access directory, and (2) requiring identification signs, where appropriate, at all public access areas created through the permit process.

- e. The Commission should actively conduct a public information outreach program to acquaint all relevant agencies and the public with the Commission's activities, publications, and enforcement responsibilities.

### C. Implementation Techniques Requiring Further Study

There are a number of implementation techniques that should be studied further to improve public access to the Bay. These techniques are discussed below.

#### 1. BCDC Shoreline Band Jurisdiction

As noted above, the McAteer-Petris Act provides that inadequate public access is a basis for permit denial. However, this authority may affect the Commission's ability to achieve maximum feasible public access.

The Bay Plan, when adopted by the Commission in 1968, recommended that the BCDC shoreline band jurisdiction should extend 1,000 feet inland. However, when the McAteer-Petris Act was amended in 1969, the Legislature set the Commission's jurisdiction at 100 feet. Since then, questions have been raised from time to time about the adequacy of the Commission's 100-foot shoreline band in achieving maximum public access.

Partly in response to these questions, the consultant engaged by the Commission to prepare the background report for the Bay Commission and Coastal Commission's recommendations to the Legislature on how the BCDC program should be related to the Coastal Commission program looked into the adequacy of the Commission's shoreline band jurisdiction. In his investigation, he found only one example where the 100-foot shoreline band "was of inadequate depth to assure public access to the water in connection with facilities actually built near the shoreline." He therefore concluded that "during the eight years of the operation of BCDC...the 100-foot shoreline band has been sufficient for the Commission to adequately protect...public access to the Bay shoreline."

Nevertheless, the consultant recognized that what had been true in the past may not remain true in the future. He therefore recommended that the Commission establish a monitoring

system to take account of future change in the present situation with regard the shoreline band. Although, his recommendation was directed primarily toward ensuring that priority use areas were not preempted for non-priority uses in areas beyond the 100-foot shoreline band, such a system could and should also consider developments that might possibly adversely affect opportunities for public access.

## **2. Relationship with Other State Agencies**

Existing State agencies such as State Lands Commission, Department of Fish and Game, and Department of Parks and Recreation, have the authority to control and manage land for public use. While cooperation and coordination with these agencies has been generally good, continued efforts should be made to further improve this relationship with special emphasis on acquisition and management of areas for public access that cannot be achieved through the permit process.

## **3. Relationship with Local Agencies**

The cooperation of regional and local agencies on Bay-related issues is vital to the continued success of the Commission's activities on behalf of the public. Most of these agencies are responsible for approval of projects that may also require a Commission permit. However, there have been occasions where a lack of complete coordination and communication has caused undue hardship on applicants, particularly with regard to the Commission's public access requirements. There are a number of areas where both the Commission and the various agencies can effect improvements to the benefit of both.

First, the Commission should undertake a program to further inform and educate local agencies with regard to the BCDC public access requirements.

Also, the Commission should adopt a policy that clearly informs other agencies of their need to provide public access consistent with the Commission's requirements as a condition of project approval. In addition, further consideration should be given to possible statutory changes that might be necessary to strengthen the requirements for consistent public access to the Bay. Any consideration should include investigation of amendments of the McAteer-Petris Act, the Subdivision Map Act, and other appropriate statutes.

Once the permit process has been exhausted as a means of providing shoreline public access, the local agency usually must consider acquisition as a means of providing the access. However, the necessary costs of acquisition and development cannot

always be met with local funds. Therefore, to assist local agencies in funding for acquisition and management of public access areas, a listing of funding sources is contained in Appendix B.

#### 4. Coastal Conservancy

The Coastal Conservancy is a State agency involved with the acquisition of shoreline areas for public use. The Conservancy was created in 1976 as an important implementation tool for the policies of the California Coastal Act of 1976. It is charged with implementing a program of agricultural protection, coastal resource restoration and enhancement in the coastal zone consistent with the policies and guidelines of the Coastal Act, by acquiring property interests within the coastal zone.

A number of privately-owned shoreline areas needed for achieving public access continuity are not likely to be available for this use, unless and until they can be acquired or otherwise set aside for public use. These are generally sites that are not likely to be developed for some time but may be desirable for public access in the immediate future. For example, an area may be critical for providing public access continuity, but not be subject to any development that would require a BCDC permit. In these cases, the Coastal Conservancy could potentially assist in providing the access link.

Of particular applicability to the Bay, the Conservancy can purchase potential park areas and hold them until an appropriate agency can acquire the property. Further, and most relevant to the Public Access Supplement, the Act creating the Coastal Conservancy vests in the Department of Parks and Recreation "authority to implement a system of public accessways to and along the state's coastline." The Conservancy is authorized to award grants to the Department for planning, acquisition, development, and maintenance of the accessways of more than local significance. In order to carry out its mandate, the Department is required to "adopt standards to guide federal, state, and local public agencies in acquiring and developing public access to coastal resources."

It is apparent that the Coastal Conservancy and the Bay Commission share common goals. However, the Conservancy's authority is limited to the ocean coastline. The enlargement of the Conservancy to include San Francisco Bay, would provide the Commission with an important implementation tool for providing additional public access beyond what would be provided through the permit process. The Conservancy might also become a valuable mechanism for improving impaired ecological resources along the Bay and helping to redevelop urban shorelines.

The Commission has already recommended that the Conservancy's jurisdiction be expanded to include the Bay as part of the recommendations to the Legislature resulting from the recent Coastal Commission-BCDC Study (June 1978).

5. Findings

- a. Questions have been periodically raised regarding the adequacy of the Commission's 100-foot shoreline band jurisdiction in achieving maximum feasible public access to the Bay.
- b. A number of existing state agencies have the authority to control, acquire and manage land in and around the Bay. Coordination and cooperation with these agencies has been generally good, albeit informal; however, there is room for improvement.
- c. Close cooperation, coordination and communication between regional and local agencies, and the Commission are necessary to insure the continued achievement of maximum feasible public access to the Bay.
- d. A number of privately-owned shoreline areas needed for achieving public access continuity to and along the Bay are not likely to be provided for this use unless and until they can be acquired or otherwise set aside for the public.
- e. The Coastal Conservancy, created in 1976 as an implementation tool for the policies of the Coastal Act, and the Bay Commission share common goals with regard to protection, restoration and enhancement of shoreline resources. However, the Conservancy authority, which includes acquisition of property interests, is limited to the ocean coastline.
- f. The mandate of the Commission does not include the authority to acquire or administer property.

6. Conclusions

- a. As part of the monitoring system recommended in the Coastal Commission/BCDC report (June 1978), the Commission should consider studying the effect on public access of developments near the Bay, but outside the 100-foot shoreline band. Specifically,



the study should identify areas of the shoreline in which public access may have been affected by developments occurring between the 100-foot shoreline band and the nearest public thoroughfare since 1969, and whether the significance of the effects on public access is such to warrant further study or action by the Commission.

- b. The Commission should continue to explore all methods of improving cooperation and coordination with all the various State agencies involved with Bay-related issues, especially public access. Since many of the lands involved provide for recreational uses, this study should be pursued as part of the proposed revisions to the Bay Plan section on Recreation.
- c. All agencies, state, regional, and local, that approve projects should assure that approval provisions and conditions related to the Bay are consistent with the Commission's requirements, particularly with regard to public access.
- d. As already recommended by the Commission, the Coastal Conservancy is a means for increasing public access to the Bay when this access is not achievable through the permit process. The Commission should continue to actively support legislation increasing the Conservancy's authority to include San Francisco Bay.
- e. The Commission should provide advice and counsel to regional and local agencies on Bay-related issues, particularly public access. To this end, the directory of funding sources related to public access should be updated biennially for distribution to these agencies.

D. Other Public Access Issues Considered

1. In-Lieu Public Access

The question of in-lieu access, that is, access provided elsewhere than the project site, has been often raised. As early as 1972, the staff investigated the various implications of this concept, particularly the idea of charging in-lieu fees to finance off-site public access. While the concept was well founded in existing law, particularly in park dedication ordinances, the staff concluded that the levying of such fees would not be in the best public interest. For example, a fee

system would require the promulgation of dimensional standards for application to all projects subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. The staff and Design Review Board felt that such standards would be counterproductive since they would stifle design imagination and be generally used as the maximum achievement instead of the minimum requirement. Also, the Bay shoreline is such a varied resource that reasonable and equitable standards for the design of public access would be difficult, if not impossible to devise. For these and other legal reasons, the staff feels that in-lieu fees, as a substitute for the public access requirement, should not be pursued at this time.

On the other hand, the general concept of in-lieu access should continue to be considered as a viable means of obtaining appropriate public access on a case-by-case basis. The Commission exercised its discretion in this regard when it required the Ports of Oakland and San Francisco to provide public access at locations apart from the immediate project area, largely due to safety, security, or use conflict considerations. On the basis of such experiences the Commission should continue to seek public access as part of each project, even if it must be provided off-site.

## 2. Security and Liability

In his examination of security and maintenance issues, the Commission's consultant found that "security seems to be a minimal problem." The consultant also prepared a special report on the issue of public liability in which he found that there is nothing to substantiate the applicants' oft-expressed fear of law suits on liability issues related to public access areas.

## 3. Findings

- a. Because of public safety or use conflict considerations, public access as part of a specific project site may not always be feasible. In these cases, in-lieu public access, e.g., access provided elsewhere than the specific project site, has been utilized in a some situations as an appropriate means of satisfying the Commission's public access requirements.
- b. An in-lieu system based upon fees charged applicants appears to present unique problems with regard to public access. In order to be equitably administered, such a system would require the promulgation of specific standards, which would stifle design imagination and generally be used as the maximum achievement instead of the minimum requirement.

- c. According to the Commission's consultant, security at public access areas appears to be a minimal problem. In addition, the consultant found there have been no reports of injuries, accidents, claims, lawsuits, increased insurance premiums, or other liability-related issues in connection with public access areas required as a condition of a BCDC permit.

#### 4. Conclusions

- a. The Commission should continue to utilize the in-lieu concept as a positive means of providing increased public access to the Bay.
- b. The Commission should periodically review security and liability issues related to public access in order to keep abreast of any changes that may require further Commission action.

## APPENDIX A

### **ADOPTED BAY PLAN AMENDMENTS TO FINDINGS AND POLICIES ON PUBLIC ACCESS AND APPEARANCE, DESIGN, AND SCENIC VIEWS AND PORTIONS OF PART V, CARRYING OUT THE BAY PLAN**

(NOTE: These amendments to the Findings and Policies on Public Access, Appearance and Design, and Scenic Views, and portions of Part V, were adopted by the Commission on April 5, 1979.)

## PUBLIC ACCESS

### Findings

- a. San Francisco Bay is a dominant feature of the nine county Bay Area. It provides an environment for numerous forms of public enjoyment including viewing, photography, nature study, fishing, wading, walking, bicycling, and jogging, or just sitting beside the water. As an outstanding visual resource, the Bay is an important focal point for the entire region that serves to orient people to its various parts.
- b. Public access required by the Commission usually consists of pedestrian access to and along the shoreline and beaches of San Francisco Bay. It may include certain improvements, such as paving, landscaping, and street furniture; and it may allow for additional uses, such as bicycling, fishing, picnicking, nature education, etc. Visual access to the Bay is a critical part of public access. The Design Review Board was formed in 1970 of professional designers to advise the Commission on the adequacy of public access of proposed projects in accordance with the Bay Plan.
- c. Although public access to the approximately 1000-mile Bay shoreline has increased significantly since the adoption of the Bay Plan in 1968, there is still only a small part of the shoreline open to the public. The full potential for access to the Bay, particularly along urban waterfronts, has by no means yet been reached.
- d. Public agencies have contributed to improved Bay access by providing a substantial number of the parks shown in the Bay Plan maps. In addition, many agencies and communities continue to examine the waterfronts in their jurisdictions and have proposed new points of public access to the Bay.

However, other demands for governmental services will necessarily limit funds for the provision of shoreline access by these agencies. Clearly, additional public access to the Bay is needed, and this can be provided, in part at least, by private capital in a wide variety of shoreline developments..

- e. Although opportunities for views of the Bay from public access areas have increased since the Bay Plan was adopted in 1968, there are still a significant number of shoreline areas where there exists little or no visual access to the Bay.
- f. Public access areas obtained through the permit process are most utilized if they provide physical access, provide connections to public rights-of-way, are related to adjacent uses, are designed, improved, and maintained clearly to indicate their public character, and provide visual access to the Bay.
- g. In some cases, certain uses may unduly conflict with accompanying public access. For example, uncontrolled public access may adversely impact sensitive wildlife areas, or some port or water-related industrial activities may pose a substantial hazard to public access users.

#### Policies

- 1. In addition to the public access to the Bay provided by waterfront parks, beaches, marinas, and fishing piers, maximum feasible access to and along the waterfront and on any permitted fills should be provided in and through every new development in the Bay or on the shoreline, whether it be for housing, industry, port, airport, public facility, or other use, except in cases where public access is clearly inconsistent with the project because of public safety considerations or significant use conflicts. In these cases, access at other locations, preferably near the project, should be provided whenever feasible.
- 2. Public access to some natural areas should be provided to permit study and enjoyment of these areas (e.g. by boardwalks or piers in or adjacent to some sloughs or marshes). However, some wildlife habitats may be sensitive to human intrusion. For this reason, projects in such areas should be carefully evaluated in consultation with appropriate agencies to determine the appropriate location and type of access to be provided.
- 3. Whenever public access to the Bay is provided as a condition of development, on fill or on the shoreline, the access should be permanently guaranteed. This should be done wherever

appropriate by requiring dedication of fee title or easements at no cost to the public, in the same manner that streets, park sites, and school sites are dedicated to the public as part of the subdivision process in cities and counties.

4. Public access improvements provided as a condition of any approval should be consistent with the project and the physical environment, including protection of natural resources, and provide for the public's safety and convenience. The improvements should be designed and built to encourage diverse Bay-related activities and movement to and along the shoreline, should permit barrier-free access for the physically handicapped to the maximum feasible extent, should include an ongoing maintenance program, and should be identified with appropriate signs.
5. In some areas, a small amount of fill may be allowed if the fill is necessary--and is the minimum absolutely required--to develop the project in accordance with the Commission's public access requirements.
6. Access to the waterfront should be provided by walkways, trails, or other appropriate means and connect to the nearest public thoroughfare where convenient parking or public transportation may be available.
7. Roads near the edge of the water should be designed as scenic parkways for slow-moving, principally recreational, traffic. The roadway and right-of-way design should maintain and enhance visual access for the traveler, discourage through traffic, and provide for safe, separated, and improved physical access to and along the shore. Public transit use and connections to the shoreline should be encouraged where appropriate.
8. Federal, state, regional and local jurisdictions, special districts, and the Commission should cooperate to provide new public access, especially to link the entire series of shoreline parks and existing public access areas to the extent feasible without additional Bay filling or adversely affecting natural resources. State, regional and local agencies that approve projects should assure that provisions for public access to and along the shoreline are included as conditions of approval, and that the access is consistent with the Commission's requirements and Guidelines.
9. The Public Access Supplement to the Bay Plan should be used as a guide in determining whether a project provides maximum feasible public access. The Design Review Board should advise the Commission regarding the adequacy of the public access proposed.

## APPEARANCE, DESIGN AND SCENIC VIEWS

### Findings

- a. Much too often, shoreline developments have not taken advantage of the magnificent setting provided by the Bay. Some shoreline developments are of poor quality or are inappropriate to a waterfront location. These include uses such as parking lots and some industrial structures, which neither visually complement the Bay nor take advantage of a waterfront location. Over time, existing shoreline development of poor quality and inappropriate uses will be phased out or up-graded by normal market forces and by public action, or by a combination of both.
- b. Unsightly debris, such as plastic bottles, old tires, and other refuse continues to mar the appearance of the shoreline, particularly of marshes, mudflats, and sloughs.
- c. The appearance of the Bay, and people's enjoyment of it as a scenic resource, contribute to the enjoyment of daily life in the Bay Area. As a special kind of open space, the Bay acts as both the unifying element of the entire Bay region and as a physical divider of its parts. The wide surface of the Bay and the distant vistas it affords, offer relief from the crowded, often chaotic, urbanized scene and help to create a sense of psychological well-being.
- d. Probably the most widely enjoyed "use" of the Bay is simply viewing it--from the shoreline, from the water and from afar. For example: a Bay view can add substantially to the value of a home, office, or apartment building in San Francisco and other Bayside communities. Also, the Bay is a major visitor attraction for the tourist industry.
- e. As a world-renowned scenic resource, the Bay is viewed and appreciated from many locations in the region. However, full advantage has not been taken of the dramatic view potential from the hills and other inland locations surrounding the Bay, often because of poor road and street layout and poorly located buildings or landscaping. While some jurisdictions have adopted controls on building heights and locations, there is still no general attention to maximizing views from streets and roads and to obtaining public view areas. In particular, along many urban waterfronts, man-made obstructions such as buildings, parking lots, utility lines, fences, billboards and even landscaping have eliminated or severely diminished views of the Bay and shoreline.

- f. One of the visual attractions of San Francisco Bay is its abundance of wildlife, particularly birds which are constantly moving around the Bay waters, marshes, and mudflats in search of food and refuge.

#### Policies

1. To enhance the visual quality of development around the Bay and to take maximum advantage of the attractive setting it provides, the shores of the Bay should be developed in accordance with the Public Access Design Guidelines and the General Development Guide.
2. All Bayfront development should be designed to enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay. Maximum efforts should be made to provide, enhance, or preserve views of the Bay and shoreline, especially from public areas, from the Bay itself, and from the opposite shore. To this end, planning of waterfront development should include participation by professionals who are knowledgeable of BCDC's concerns such as landscape architects, urban designers, or architects, working in conjunction with engineers and professionals in other fields.
3. In some areas, a small amount of fill may be allowed if the fill is necessary--and is the minimum absolutely required--to develop the project in accordance with the Commission's design recommendations.
4. Structures and facilities that do not take advantage of or visually complement the Bay should be located and designed so as not to impact visually on the Bay and shoreline. In particular, parking areas should be located away from the shoreline. However, some small parking areas for fishing access and Bay viewing may be allowed in exposed locations.
5. To enhance the maritime atmosphere of the Bay Area, ports should be designed, whenever feasible, to permit public access and viewing of port activities by means of (a) view points (e.g. piers, platforms, or towers), restaurants, etc., that would not interfere with port operations, and (b) openings between buildings and other site designs that permit views from nearby roads.
6. Additional bridges over the Bay should be avoided, to the extent possible, to preserve the visual impact of the large expanse of the Bay. The design of new crossings deemed necessary relate to others nearby and should be located between promontories or other land forms that naturally suggest themselves as connections reaching across the Bay (but



without destroying the obvious character of the promontory). New or remodeled bridges across the Bay should be designed to permit maximum viewing of the Bay and its surroundings by both motorists and pedestrians. Guard rails and bridge supports should be designed with views in mind.

7. Access routes to Bay crossings should be designed so as to orient the traveler to the Bay (as in the main approaches to the Golden Gate Bridge). Similar consideration should be given to the design of highway and mass transit routes paralleling the Bay (by providing frequent views of the Bay, if possible, so the traveler knows which way he is moving in relation to the Bay). Guardrails, fences, landscaping, and other structures related to such routes should be designed and located so as to maintain and to take advantage of Bay views. New or rebuilt roads in the hills above the Bay and in areas along the shores of the Bay should be constructed as scenic parkways in order to take full advantage of the commanding views of the Bay.
8. Shoreline developments should be built in clusters, leaving open area around them, to permit more frequent views of the Bay. Developments along the shores of tributary waterways should be Bay-related and should be designed to preserve and enhance views along the waterway, so as to provide maximum visual contact with the Bay.
9. "Unnatural" debris should be removed from sloughs, marshes, and mudflats that are retained as part of the ecological system. Sloughs, marshes, and mudflats should be restored to their former natural state if they have been despoiled by human activities.
10. Towers, bridges, or other structures near or over the Bay should be designed as landmarks that suggest the location of the waterfront when it is not visible, especially in flat areas. But such landmarks should be low enough to assure the continued visual dominance of the hills around the Bay.
11. In areas of the Bay where oil and gas drilling or production platforms are permitted, they should be treated or screened, including derrick removal, so they will be compatible with the surrounding open water, mudflat, marsh, or shore area.
12. In order to achieve a high level of design quality, the Commission's Design Review Board, composed of design and planning professionals, should review, evaluate and advise the Commission on the proposed design of developments that affect the appearance of the Bay in accordance with the Bay Plan Findings and Policies on Public Access, Appearance, Design

and Scenic Views; the General Development Guide; and the Public Access Design Guidelines. City, county, regional, state and federal agencies should be guided in their evaluation of bayfront projects by the above guidelines.

13. Local governments should be encouraged to eliminate inappropriate shoreline uses and poor quality shoreline conditions by regulation and by public actions (including development financed wholly or partly by public funds). The Commission should assist in this regard to the maximum feasible extent by providing advice on Bay-related appearance and design issues, and by coordinating the activities of the various agencies that may be involved with projects affecting the Bay and its appearance.
14. Views of the Bay from vista points, from roads, and from other areas should be maintained by appropriate arrangements and heights of all developments and landscaping between the view areas and the water. In this regard, particular attention should be given to all waterfront locations, areas below vista points, and areas along roads that provide good views of the Bay for travelers, particularly areas below roads coming over ridges and providing a "first view" of the Bay (shown in Plan Map 2, Proposed Major Uses of the Bay and Shoreline).
15. Vista points should be provided in the general locations indicated in the Plan maps. Access to vista points should be provided by walkways, trails, or other appropriate means and connect to the nearest public thoroughfare where parking or public transportation is available. In some cases, exhibits, museums, or markers would be desirable at vista points to explain the value or importance of the areas being viewed.

#### PART V: CARRYING OUT THE BAY PLAN

##### Control of Filling and Dredging in the Bay

#### 1. Permit Procedures for Filling and Dredging

g. Appearance. Plans for a proposed fill project should be submitted to the Design Review Board appointed by the Commission and consisting of professionals in the fields of urban design, architecture, landscape architecture and engineering. The Design Review Board should determine whether the proposed project is in accordance with the policies for

Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views of the Bay and shoreline and should report its recommendations to the Commission before a permit is issued. The jurisdiction over appearance and design is advisory, and the Commission encourages local governing bodies to exercise their controls in accordance with the Commission's policies on Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views, and the Design Review Board's recommendations.

### Developing the Bay and Shoreline to their Highest Potential

#### 2. Purposes for Which a Permit May be Issued

c. Appearance. The Commission has appointed a Design Review Board made up of representatives of the design professions including architecture, landscape architecture and engineering. The Board reviews and makes recommendations to the Commission on the appearance and design of proposed projects, evaluating them in the light of the policies for Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views. Its recommendations are advisory only and are not of themselves grounds for denying a permit.

## APPENDIX B

### **FUNDING SOURCES FOR PUBLIC ACCESS**

The following listing, complete as of March 30, 1979, represents those agencies and organizations known to BCDC that have the capacity and interest to fund projects or portions of projects that would provide public access to the Bay in those areas it would not likely be provided through private development. While it is intended to be as complete as possible, it should not be considered the final word on the subject. Each individual entity should be contacted directly for further information.

Each public agency entry is in the following sequence: Title of program or enabling act; Purpose(s) funded: (A) Acquisition, (D) Development, (P) Planning, or (S) Special; Criteria for Grants; Share or matching grant information; Agency name and address.

The private sources listings provides only the name, address, and a sample listing of a previous project that may be related to the Bay or similar resources.

#### **A. Public Agency Sources**

##### **1. Federal Programs**

###### **a. Land and Water Conservation Fund**

(A/D) Acquisition and/or development of outdoor recreation areas and facilities. Emphasis on meeting regionwide and urban recreation needs. Fifty percent (50%) federal grant with state or local governments matching the remaining 50%. Administered at the Federal level by the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service. Contact the State Department of Parks and Recreation, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, 95814.

###### **b. Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (Title X of P.L. 95-625)**

(D/P/S) Signed into law on November 10, 1978, this five year program is intended to stimulate ongoing local efforts to revitalize and maintain troubled urban park and recreation systems. Provides matching grants in three program categories to (1) restore

urban park facilities which have fallen into disuse or disrepair (70% Federal-30% local); (2) encourage innovations in recreation programming (also 70%-30% match); and (3) stimulate and support local commitments to recreation system recovery and maintenance (50%-50% match). Administered by the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, 94102.

c. Disposal of Surplus Federal Property - Federal Real Property Grants

(A) Acquisition of park, recreation and historic areas. Makes land available at discounts of fair market value for public recreation. Historic sites are made available at no charge. Inquire at Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, 94102, for information on acquiring land for park or recreation purposes. Queries relative to historic monument and other purpose should be addressed to the General Services Administration, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, 94102.

d. National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

(A/D) Makes grants for history preservation, acquisition and restoration. Places emphasis on preservation of local, regional and state historical sites and places. Fifty percent (50%) reimbursement of project cost. Contact the State Historic Preservation Officer, Department of Parks and Recreation, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, 95814.

e. Housing and Community Development Act of 1974

(D) Provides 100% discretionary grant funding (in excess of predetermined block grant amounts) for physical community development activities, including parks and recreation. Contact the Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, 94102.

f. Bicycle Transportation and Pedestrian Walkways

(D) To develop and improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Has emphasis on safety, contiguous routes and effective use of highway right-of-way to encourage bicycle transportation. Provides 70%

Federal, 30% State funding on a \$2.5 million per State per year maximum obligation. Contact Federal Highway Administration through the State Department of Transportation, 1120 "N" Street, Sacramento, 95814.

g. Housing and Community Development Block Grants

(S) These funds are disbursed from the Department of Housing and Urban Development for a variety of community development purposes. HUD has extensive regulations as to the proper uses of these monies and should be contacted for further information, application procedures, eligible activities, recipient requirements. (Address listed in 5, above)

h. Public Works and Development Act of 1965

(S) Provides 50% to 80% Federal grants; based on unemployment rate, and loans when other alternatives are not available. Emphasizes the creation of long-term employment opportunity by planning technical assistance, business loans, public works and grants. Parks and recreation facilities are also provided for. Inquire at the Economic Development Administration, 1700 Westlake Avenue, Seattle, Washington, 98109.

i. Community Action Program - Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (P. L. 88-452)

(S) Helps urban and rural communities mobilize their resources to combat poverty and includes funds for recreation leadership, salaries, training, research and recreation equipment. Private, non-profit or public agencies are eligible. Contact the State Employment Development Department, 555 Capitol Mall, Room 329, Sacramento, 95814.

j. National Endowment for the Arts Grants

(S) Provides 100% to individuals, 50% to organizations for a wide variety of art, dance, music, and allied projects. Contact the National Endowment for the Arts, 2401 "E" Street N.W., Washington D.C., 20506.

k. General Assistance

(S) In addition to the various grant programs noted above, the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service (formerly the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation)

has prepared a number of booklets designed "to assist government agencies and non-profit organizations involved in leisure services and heritage preservation to stretch their limited dollars for maximum effectiveness and public benefit." For example, the "Federal Assistance Handbook" lists nearly 200 federal programs. Contact Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, P. O. Box 36062, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102.

## 2. State Programs

### a. Bicycle Lane Account (SB 244, 1976)

(A/D) For acquisition and development of bicycle lanes. Ninety percent (90%) funding to be matched by 10% local agency funding. Contact the State Department of Transportation, Bicycle Program Coordinator, 1120 "N" Street, Sacramento, 95814.

### b. Wildlife Conservation Act of 1947

(A/D) Provides 50% to 100% funding for costs of acquiring and/or developing hunting, fishing access, fishing piers, lake construction and wildlife habitat preservation or improvement. Contact the Wildlife Conservation Board, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, 95814.

### c. Navigation and Ocean Development Loans and Grants

(P/D) For planning and construction loans for marinas; grants for launching facilities. For criteria, share allocation and other information, contact the California Department of Boating and Waterways, 1629 "S" Street, Sacramento, 95814.

### d. Sales Tax on Gasoline Fund (SB 325, 821)

(A) Purpose is to make available 2% of the gasoline tax fund for pedestrian and bicycle routes. Contact the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Hotel Claremont, Berkeley, 94704.

### e. Urban Open Space and Recreation Grant Program (SB 174)

(A/D) Provides 75% grants for acquisition and development of park and recreation areas and facilities, both indoor and outdoor. Grants must

supplement and supplant local expenditures. Contact Department of Parks and Recreation, Office of Grants and Local Assistance, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, 95814.

f. Off-Highway Vehicle Grants Program

(A/D) For acquisition and development of trails and areas of use for off-highway vehicles. Public participation in off-highway vehicle planning is required under this program. Seventy-five percent grants are made. (See address in 5, above)

g. Davis-Grunsky Act

(D) Provides loans and grants to local water agencies with emphasis on recreation, fisheries, and wildlife aspects of multi-purpose water control projects. Grants allocated only to recreation portion of projects. Department of Water Resources, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, 95814.

h. 1974 State Grant Program (Z'berg-Collier Park Bond Act)

(A) For acquisition of beaches, parks, recreational facilities and historic resources. One hundred percent (100%) grant funding not to exceed funds allocated to applicant by county's priority plan for expenditure. Projects are selected at the local level. Apply to the Department of Parks and Recreation, Office of Grants and Local Assistance, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, 95814.

i. 1976 State Grant Program (Nejedly-Hart Park Bond Act)

(A) For acquisition of outdoor recreation or historic projects. (See address in 8, above)

h. Keene-Nejedly Wetlands Conservation Act

(A) Authorizes cooperative action of the Departments of Fish and Game and Parks and Recreation to acquire interests in real property, less than fee, for the preservation and protection of the state's wetlands as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5810. Ordered these departments to submit a study of wetlands in California and to submit it to the Legislature by January 15, 1978. Authorizes these departments to enter into agreements with local



governments and districts for management and control of wetlands for their preservation and to insure the right of the people to the use and enjoyment of those wetlands. Contact the Department of Parks and Recreation, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, 95814.

B. Private Sources (all listings are Foundations except where designated as a Fund)

1. Cowell (S.H.), 68 Post Street, Room 718, San Francisco 94120: \$20,000 to the Hunter's Point Community Youth Park Foundation for playground equipment.
2. Gellert (Carl), 2222 19th Avenue, San Francisco 94116: \$5,000 to the City of Daly City for park and recreation facilities and equipment.
3. Gellert (Fred), 2222 19th Avenue, San Francisco 94116: \$5,000 to the City of Daly City for park and recreation facilities.
4. Gerbode (Wallace Alexander), 149 Ninth Street, San Francisco 94103: \$25,000 to the Fort Mason Foundation for housing and technical assistance in arts, recreation and ecology using Fort Mason facilities.
5. Hewlett (William and Flora), 2 Palo Alto Square, Palo Alto 94302: \$5,000 to the Point Reyes Bird Observatory.
6. Kaiser (Henry J.) Family, 2 Palo Alto Square, Suite 1010, Palo Alto 94304: \$73,000 to the Center for Independent Living, Inc.
7. Nelson (Florence), 3100 Crocker Plaza, San Francisco 94104: \$1,000 to the Desert Shelter for Animals.
8. Packard (David and Lucille), 330 Second Street, Los Altos 94022: \$15,000 to the Conservancy.
9. Sierra Club, 530 Bush Street, San Francisco 94108: \$4,400 to the Citizens Waterfront Committee.
10. Skaggs, The, 1123 Central Building, Oakland 94612: Preference to East Bay Projects.
11. L. J. Skaggs and Mary C. Skaggs, 1330 Broadway, Suite 1730, Oakland 94612: Preference to minority affairs and current community concerns.

12. Sorensen (Harvey L.) and Maud C. Sorensen, c/o Bancroft, Avery and McAllister, 240 Stockton Street, San Francisco 94108: \$10,800 to Ducks Unlimited.
13. Stulsaft (Morris), The, 100 Bush Street, Room 500, San Francisco 94104: \$15,600 to Vine Village, Inc., of Napa for remodeling winter day camp recreation facility: \$16,300 to the Boys Club of Richmond.
14. Weeden, c/o John Weeden, 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco 94104: \$4,300 to the Nature Conservancy; \$1,000 to the Sierra Club; and \$1,000 to Poricy Park.
15. Dean Witter, 57 Post Street, San Francisco 94104: \$6,000 to the Suisun Conservation Fund; \$2,500 to California Trout. Secondary emphasis on wildlife preservation in Northern California.

C. Other Sources

1. Ahmanson, 3731 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles 90010
2. Atlantic Richfield, 515 Flower Street, Los Angeles 90017
3. Fleischmann (Max C.), P. O. Box 1871, One East Liberty Street, Reno Nevada 89505
4. Irvine (James), 450 Newport Center Drive, Suite 545, Newport Beach 92660
5. Kresge, 2401 West Big Beaver Road, Troy, Michigan 48084
6. Mott (Charles Stewart), 500 Mott Foundation Building, Flint, Michigan 48502
7. San Francisco, 425 California Street, Room 1602, San Francisco 94104
8. Zellerbach Family Fund, 260 California Street, Suite 1010, San Francisco 94111
9. Zellerbach (Harold and Doris) Fund, 1 Bush Street, Number 1863, San Francisco 94119
10. Zellerbach (William and Margery), P. O. Box 7748, San Francisco 94119
11. Registry of Charitable Trusts, Wells Fargo Building, 1315 Fifth Street, Room 443, Sacramento, 95813

12. "Where the Money's At - 1978," Tobey, Patricia Blair, Editor; Warner, Irving R., Contributing Editor. ICPR Publications, Los Angeles, New York, Washington D.C., \$17.00.
13. "Guide to California Foundations," prepared by the San Francisco Study Center, 1095 Market Street, San Francisco 94103, \$6.00 prepaid.
14. Non-Profit Organizations with capability to acquire and hold land for park, open space, or conservation purposes:
  - Trust for Public Land (TPL), 82 2nd Street, San Francisco, 94105
  - The Nature Conservancy, Western Regional Office, 425 Bush Street, San Francisco, 94108
  - National Audubon Society, Western Regional Office, 555 Audubon Place, Sacramento, 92501
  - Marin Conservation League, 1330 Lincoln Avenue, San Rafael, 94901

NOAA COASTAL SERVICES CENTER LIBRARY



3 6668 14102 8029